arXiv:1608.05287v2 [math.AC] 22 Aug 2016

The University of Sheffield

School of Mathematics and Statistics

On the Finite F-representation type and F-signature of hypersurfaces

By

Khaled Alhazmy

2016

Contents

1 Introduction **4**

2 Preliminaries **7**

2.1 Modules over rings of prime characteristic p 7

2.2 The Cokernl of Matrix 14

2.3 Maximal Cohen Maculay Modules 32

3 Matrix Factorization **36**

3.1 Definitions and Properties 36

3.2 Matrix factorization and Maximal Cohen Maculay modules 39

4 The finite F-representation type over hypersurfaces **44**

4.1 Rings of finite F-representation type 44

4.2 The presentation of $F^e_*(S/fS)$ as a cokernel of a Matrix Factorization of f 49

4.3 The ring $S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$ has finite F-representation type 62

4.4 When does the ring $S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$ have finite F-representation type? 65

4.5 Class of rings that have FFRT but not finite CM type 75

4.6 S/I has FFRT when I is a monomial ideal 80

5 F-signature of specific hypersurfaces **82**

5.1 The F-signature of $\frac{S[[u,v]]}{f+uv}$ when f is a monomial 83

5.2 The F-signature of S/fS and $S[[y]]/fS[[y]]$ are the same 88

5.3 The F-signature of $\frac{S[[z]]}{(f+z^2)}$ when f is a monomial 89

5.4 The F-signature of the ring $S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$ 93

Bibliography 94

Summary

Let $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ or $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ be either a polynomial or a formal power series ring in a finite number of variables over a field K of characteristic $p > 0$ with $[K : K^p] < \infty$. Let R be the hypersurface S/fS where f is a nonzero nonunit element of S. If e is a positive integer, $F^e_*(R)$ denotes the R-algebra structure induced on R via the e-times iterated Frobenius map ($r \to r^{p^e}$). We show an existence of a matrix factorization of f whose cokernel is isomorphic to $F^e_*(R)$ as R-module. The presentation of $F^e_*(R)$ as the cokernel of a matrix factorization of f enables us to find a characterization from which we can decide when the ring $S[[u, v]]/(f+uv)$ has Finite F-representation type (FFRT) where $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$. This allows us to create a class of rings that have Finite F-representation type but it does not have finite CM type. For $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$, we use this presentation to show that the ring $S[[y]]/(y^{p^d} + f)$ has finite F-representation type for any f in S. Furthermore, we proved that S/I has Finite F-representation type when I is a monomial ideal in either $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ or $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$. Finally, this presentation enables us to compute the F-signature of the rings $S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ and $S[[z]]/(f + z^2)$ where $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and f is a monomial in the ring S.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a commutative Noetherian local ring of Krull dimension d and residue field K. The symbol $\mathbb{N}$ stands for the set of positive integers. A non-zero R-module M is maximal Cohen-Macaulay (MCM) provided it is finitely generated and there exists an M-regular sequence $r_1, \ldots, r_d$ in the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. In particular, R is a Cohen-Macaulay (CM) ring if R is a MCM module over itself. The ring R is said to have finite Cohen-Macaulay type (or finite CM type) if there are, up to isomorphism, only finitely many indecomposable MCM R-modules. If R has a prime characteristic p, and M is a finitely generated R-module, for each $e \in \mathbb{N}$ by $F^e_*(M)$ we denote the abelian group M that has an R-module structure via $rF^e_*(m) = F^e_*(r^{p^e}m)$ for all $m \in M$ and $r \in R$ where $F^e_*(m)$ denotes the corresponding element of $m \in M$ in $F^e_*(M)$. The ring R is F-finite If $F^1_*(R)$ is finitely generated R-module (or equivalently $F^e_*(R)$ is a finitely generated R-module for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$). We say that M has finite F-representation type (or has FFRT) by finitely generated R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ if for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, the R-module $F^e_*(M)$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of the R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$. As a result, if R is F-finite that has finite Cohen-Macaulay type, then R has FFRT. We provide in section 4.5 an example of class of rings that have FFRT but not finite CM type.

In 1997, Smith and Van den Bergh [20] introduced the notion of finite F-representation type (FFRT) over a class of rings for which the Krull-Remak-Schmidit Theorem holds as a characteristic p extension of the notion of finite Cohen-Macaulay representation type. They then showed that rings with finite F-representation type play

a role in developing the theory of differential operators on the rings. However, Yao in his paper [23] studied the notion of FFRT in more general settings. Takafumi Shibuta summarized in [18] several nice properties satisfied for rings of finite F-representation type. For example, the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities of such rings are proved to be rational numbers by Seibert [17]. Yao in his paper [23] proved that tight closure commutes with localization in such rings. If R is a Cohen-Macaulay ring of finite F representation type with canonical module ω_R, Takagi and Takahashi [21] proved that $H^t_I(\omega_R)$ has only finitely many associated primes for any ideal I of R and any integer t.

If $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ or $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ where K is a filed of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$, and $f \in S$, we introduce in section 4.1 a presentation of $F^e_*(S/fS)$ as a cokernel of a matrix factorization of f. A brief treatment of the concept of matrix factorization is provided in chapter 2. This presentation of $F^e_*(S/fS)$ as a cokernel of a matrix factorization of f enables us to provide in section 4.5 a class of rings that have finite F- representation type but it does have finite Cohen-Macaulay type . This method allows us also to find a characterization of when the ring $S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ has FFRT in section 4.4. In section 4.6, we proved that S/I has FFRT for any monomial ideal I in S. Furthermore, if $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$, we use this presentation to show in section 4.3 that the ring $S[[y]]/(y^{p^d} + f)$ has finite F-representation type for any f in S.

If M is a finitely generated R-module, then by [3, Proposition 2.1] M can be decomposed as $M \cong R^a \oplus N$ where a is a nonnegative integer and N is an R-module that has no free direct summand. The number a is unique and independent of the decomposition as when we take the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic completion, by the Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem a is uniquely determined. The number a is the maximal rank of a free direct summands of M and is denoted by $\sharp(M, R)$.

As a result, if R is an F-finite, for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a unique nonnegative integer a_e and an R-module M that has no free direct summand such that $F^e_*(R) = R^{a_e} \oplus M_e$ and $\sharp(F^e_*(R), R) = a_e$. Now we are ready to define the F-signature as it appears in [22] as follows

Definition 1.1 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a d-dimensional F-finite Noetherian local ring of prime characteristic p. If $[K : K^p]$ is the dimension of K as K^p-vector space and $\alpha(R) = \log_p[K : K^p]$, then the F-signature of R that is denoted by $S(R)$ is defined as*

$$S(R) = \lim_{e\to\infty} \frac{\sharp(F^e_*(R), R)}{p^{e(d+\alpha(R))}}$$

Keven Tucker in his paper [22] proved that this limit exists. The notion of the F-signature was introduced and defined by C. Huneke and G. Leuschke in [12] on F-finite local ring of prime characteristic with perfect residue field. Y. Yao in his work [24] has defined the F-signature to arbitrary local rings without the assumptions that the residue field k is perfect. The F-signature seems to give subtle information on the singularities of R. For example, the F-signature of any of the two-dimensional quotient singularities (A_n), (D_n), (E_6), (E_7), (E_8) is the reciprocal of the order of the group G defining the singularity [12, Example 18]. I. Aberbach and G. Leuschke [1] have proved that the F-signature is positive if and only if R is strongly F-regular. Furthermore, We have $S(R) \leq 1$ with equality if and only if R is regular [22, Theorem 4.16.] or [12, Corollary 16]. In Chapter 5, we compute the F-signature of specific hypersurfaces. Indeed, if K is a field of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$ and $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$, we compute in section 9 and 10 the F-signatures of the rings $S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ and $S[[z]]/(f + z^2)$ where f is a monomial and u, v, z are variables over S. We proved also in the last section that for any $f \in S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ that the rings S/fS and $S[[y_1, ..., y_n]]/fS[[y_1, ..., y_n]]$ have the same F-signature and we give a characterization of the F-signature of the ring $S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d} + f)$ for any $f \in S$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Throughout this work, we shall assume all rings are commutative with a unit, Noetherian, and have prime characteristic $p > 0$ unless otherwise is stated. We denote by $\mathbb{N}$ the set of the positive integers and the set of non-negative integers will be denoted by $\mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $q = p^e$ for some $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

Chapter 2

Preliminaries

In this chapter, we will study the modules over rings of prime characteristic p. We will consider how new module can be derived of an R-module when R has a prime characteristic. We will consider and prove some properties of the modules over rings of prime characteristic p . The definition of F-finite and F-pure rings will be provided. In the second section of this chapter, we will provide some notations and propoerties of the cokernel of a matrix and we will prove an equivalence between specific matrices that will be needed later. Section 3 of this chapter is devoted to treat briefly the basic definitions and properties of the notion of the Maximal Cohen Maculay modules that are essential for this thesis.

2.1 Modules over rings of prime characteristic p

Throughout this section, all rings are commutative of prime characteristic p, $e \in \mathbb{N}$, and $q = p^e$. Let R be a ring of prime characteristic p. For every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, and $a, b \in R$, it follows that $(a+b)^{p^e} = a^{p^e} + b^{p^e}$ and consequently the map $F^e : R \to R$ that is given by $F^e(a) = a^{p^e}$ is a ring homomorphism. This homomorphism is called the e-th Frobenius iterated map on the ring R.

Definition 2.1 *If M is an R module, $F^e_*(M)$ denotes the R-module obtained via the restriction under the Frobenius homomorphism $F^e : R \to R$. Thus, $F^e_*(M)$ is the R-module that is the same as M as an abelian group but for every $m \in M$ we set*

$F_*^e(m)$ to represent the corresponding element in $F_*^e(M)$ and the R-module structure of $F_*^e(M)$ is given by

$$rF_*^e(m) = F_*^e(r^{p^e}m) \text{ for all } m \in M \text{ and } r \in R$$

In a particular case, $F_*^e(R)$ is the abelian group R that has an R-module structure via

$$rF_*^e(a) = F_*^e(r^{p^e}a) \text{ for all } a, r \in R$$

If I is an ideal of R, then $I^{[q]}$ denotes the ideal generated by the set $\{r^q | r \in I\}$. As a result, if $I =< r_1, ..., r_n >$, then $I^{[q]} =< r_1^q, ..., r_n^q >$.

Definition 2.2 *[21, Section 1] If R and M are $\mathbb{Z}$-graded, then $F_*^e(M)$ carries a $\mathbb{Q}$-graded R-module structure: We grade $F_*^e(M)$ by putting $[F_*^e(M)]_\alpha = [M]_{p^e\alpha}$ if $\alpha \in \frac{1}{p^e}\mathbb{Z}$, otherwise $[M]_\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$.*

We can easily observe the following remark

Remark 2.3 *Let M and N be modules over a ring R. If $e \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that:*
1) $F_*^{e+d}(M) = F_*^e(F_*^d(M))$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$.
2) $F_*^e(R)$ is a ring itself, that is isomorphic to R as rings, with an addition and a multiplication given by $F_*^e(a) + F_*^e(b) = F_*^e(a+b)$ and $F_*^e(a)F_*^e(b) = F_*^e(ab)$ for all a and b in R.
3) $F_*^e(M)$ is also $F_*^e(R)$-module via $F_*^e(r)F_*^e(m) = F_*^e(rm)$ for all $m \in M$ and $r \in R$.
4) If I is an ideal then $IF_*^e(M) = F_*^e(I^{[q]}M)$.
5) If N is a submodule of M, then $F_*^e(N)$ is a submodule of $F_*^e(M)$.
6) If N is a submodule of M, then $F_*^e(M)/F_*^e(N)$ is isomorphic to $F_*^e(M/N)$ as R-module.
7) If $\phi : N \to M$ is an R-module homomorphism, then so is the map $F_*^e(\phi) : F_*^e(N) \to F_*^e(M)$ that is given by $F_*^e(\phi)(F_*^e(m)) = F_*^e(\phi(m))$ for each $m \in M$.
8) $F_*^e(-)$ is an exact functor on the category of R-modules.

Lemma 2.4 *Let M be an R-module. If W is a multiplicatively closed set of R, then $F_*^e(W^{-1}M)$ is isomorphic to $W^{-1}F_*^e(M)$ as $W^{-1}R$-module.*

Proof. For every $m \in M$ and $w \in W$, define $\phi(F_*^e(\frac{m}{w})) = \frac{F_*^e(w^{q-1}m)}{w}$. It is easy to verify that $\phi : F_*^e(W^{-1}) \to W^{-1}F_*^e(M)$ is isomorphism as $W^{-1}R$-module isomorphism. □

Lemma 2.5 *Let M be an R-module and let I be a finitely generated ideal of R. If $\widehat{M_I}$ is the I-adic completion of M, then $F^e_*(\widehat{M_I})$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{F^e_*(M)}_I$ as $\hat{R}_I$-modules.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J_n = I^n$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{F^e_*(M)}_I &= \{(F^e_*(x_n) + I^n F^e_*(M))^\infty_{n=1} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{I^n F^e_*(M)} \,|\, F^e_*(x_{n+1}) - F^e_*(x_n) \in I^n F^e_*(M)\} \\
&= \{(F^e_*(x_n) + F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M))^\infty_{n=1} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M)} \,|\, F^e_*(x_{n+1}) - F^e_*(x_n) \in F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M)\} \\
&= \lim_{\leftarrow} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M)}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F^e_*(\widehat{M_I}) &= \{F^e_*((x_n + I^n M)^\infty_{n=1}) \in F^e_*(\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{M}{I^n M}) \,|\, x_{n+1} - x_n \in I^n M\} \\
&= \{(F^e_*(x_n) + F^e_*(I^n M))^\infty_{n=1} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(I^n M)} \,|\, F^e_*(x_{n+1}) - F^e_*(x_n) \in F^e_*(I^n M)\} \\
&= \lim_{\leftarrow} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(I^n M)}
\end{aligned}$$

For m sufficiently larger than n, we find that $F^e_*(I^m M) \subseteq F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M)$ and it is obvious that $F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M) \subseteq F^e_*(I^n M)$. This shows that the families $\{F^e_*(I^n M)\}^\infty_{n=1}$ and $\{F^e_*(I^n M)\}^\infty_{n=1}$ give the same topology on $F^e_*(M)$. As a result, $\lim_{\leftarrow} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(I^n M)}$ is isomorphic to $\lim_{\leftarrow} \frac{F^e_*(M)}{F^e_*(J^{[q]}_n M)}$ and hence then $F^e_*(\widehat{M_I})$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{F^e_*(M)}_I$ as $\hat{R}_I$-modules. □

Lemma 2.6 *Let K be a field of positive prime characteristic p and $q = p^e$ for $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Let Λ be the basis of K as K^q vector space*
1) If $S := K[x_1, ..., x_n]$, then $F^e_*(S)$ is a free S-module with the basis

$$\Delta := \{F^e_*(a x_1^{k_1} x_2^{k_2} ... x_n^{k_n}) \,|\, a \in \Lambda_e, 0 \leq k_j \leq q-1, j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$$

2) If $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and K is finite K^q-vector space, then $F^e_*(S)$ is a finitely generated free S-module with the basis

$$\Delta := \{F_*^e(ax_1^{k_1}x_2^{k_2}...x_n^{k_n}) \,|\, a \in \Lambda_e, 0 \leq k_j \leq q-1, j \in \{1,...,n\}\}$$

Proof. For any $\alpha = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, let $x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1}...x_n^{\alpha_n}$.
1)Let Λ_e be a basis (not necessarily finite) of K as K^q-vector space and $\Gamma_e = \{(a_1, ..., a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n | 0 \leq a_j \leq q-1, j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$. Let f be a monomial in $S := K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ given by $f = ax^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and $a \in K$. There exists $\lambda \in \Gamma_e$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that $\alpha = q\mu + \lambda$. Since Λ_e is a basis of K as K^q-vector space, there exists a finite subset B of Λ_e such that $a = \sum_{b\in B} C_b^q b$ where $C_b \in K$ for each $b \in B$. As a result, we get that

$$F_*^e(f) = F_*^e(ax^\alpha) = \sum_{b\in B} C_b x^\mu F_*^e(bx^\lambda)$$

This shows that $\{F_*^e(\delta x^\lambda) \,|\, \delta \in \Lambda_e, \lambda \in \Gamma\}$ is a generating set of the R-module $F_*^e(S)$.
Now, if f is in $S := K[x_1, ..., x_n]$, there exists a finite set $W \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and a set $\{C_\alpha \in K | \alpha \in W\}$ such that $f = \sum_{\alpha\in W} C_\alpha x^\alpha$ and hence $F_*^e(f) = \sum_{\alpha\in W} F_*^e(C_\alpha x^\alpha)$. For each $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, we define

$$[f]_\beta = \begin{cases} C_\beta x^\beta & \text{if } \beta \in W \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$[F_*^e(f)]_\beta = \begin{cases} F_*^e(C_\beta x^\beta) & \text{if } \beta \in W \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Now, let B be a finite subset of A and $F_*^e(f) = \sum_{\delta\in B}\sum_{\lambda\in\Gamma_e} f_{(\delta,\lambda)} F_*^e(\delta x^\lambda)$ where $f_{(\delta,\lambda)} \in S$ for each $\delta \in B$ and $\lambda \in \Gamma_e$. If $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $\beta = \lambda + q\mu$ where $\lambda \in \Gamma_e$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. As a result

$$[F_*^e(f)]_\beta = \sum_{\delta\in B} [f_{(\delta,\lambda)}]_\mu F_*^e(\delta x^\lambda)$$

If $[f_{(\delta,\lambda)}]_\mu = C_{(\delta,\lambda,\mu)} x^\mu$ where $C_{(\delta,\lambda,\mu)} \in K$, we get that $f = 0$ if and only if $[F_*^e(f)]_\beta = 0$ for each $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ if and only if $\sum\limits_{\delta\in B} C_{(\delta,\lambda,\mu)}^q \delta = 0$. Since $B \subset \Lambda_e$ and Λ_e is a basis for K as K^q-vector space, $\sum\limits_{\delta\in B} C_{(\delta,\lambda,\mu)}^q \delta = 0$ if and only if $C_{(\delta,\lambda,\mu)} = 0$ for all

$\delta \in B$, $\lambda \in \Gamma_e$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. Therefore, $f = 0$ if and only if $f_{(\delta,\lambda)} = 0$ for all $\delta \in B$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. This shows that $\Delta := \{F_*^e(ax_1^{k_1}x_2^{k_2}...x_n^{k_n}) \,|\, a \in \Lambda_e, 0 \leq k_j \leq q-1, j \in \{1,...,n\}\}$ is a basis for $F_*^e(S)$ as S-module.

2)Let Λ_e be a finite basis of K as K^q-vector space and $\Gamma_e = \{(a_1,...,a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n | 0 \leq a_j \leq q-1, j \in \{1,...,n\}\}$. Let $S = K[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$. We proved that $\{F_*^e(\delta x^\lambda) | \delta \in \Lambda_e, \lambda \in \Gamma_e\}$ is a finite basis of the S-module $F_*^e(S)$. Let I be the maximal ideal of S generated by $\{x_1,...,x_n\}$. It is well known that $K[[x_1,...,x_n]] = \hat{S}_I$ see [8, Example in Page 183]. By lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_*^e(K[[x_1,...,x_n]]) &= F_*^e(\hat{S}_I) \\
&= \widehat{F_*^e(S)}_I \\
&= \hat{S}_I \otimes_S F_*^e(S) \\
&= \hat{S}_I \otimes_S \bigoplus_{\delta\in\Lambda_e}\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Gamma_e} SF_*^e(\delta x^\lambda) \\
&= \bigoplus_{\delta\in\Lambda_e}\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Gamma_e} [\widehat{S}_I \otimes_S SF_*^e(\delta x^\lambda)] \\
&= \bigoplus_{\delta\in\Lambda_e}\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Gamma_e} \widehat{SF_*^e(\delta x^\lambda)}_I
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\{F_*^e(\delta x^\lambda) | \delta \in \Lambda_e, \lambda \in \Gamma_e\}$ is a basis for $F_*^e(K[[x_1,...,x_n]])$ as $K[[x_1,...,x_n]]$-module.

□

Definition 2.7 *A Noetherian ring R is said to be F-finite if $F_*^1(R)$ is finitely generated R module (or equivalently that $F_*^e(R)$ is finitely generated R-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$)*

Corollary 2.8 *If R is F-finite ring, then it follows that:*
1) R/I is F-finite ring for any ideal I of R.
2) $R[x]$ is F-finite ring.
3) $R[[x]]$ is F-finite ring.

Proof. Let Δ be the set of R satisfying that $\{F_*^1(\delta) | \delta \in \Delta\}$ is a generating set of $F_*^1(R)$ as R-module.

1) It is easy to see that $\{F^1_*(\delta + I)|\delta \in \Delta\}$ is a generating set of $F^1_*(R/I)$ as R/I-module.
2) Let $f = \sum_{j=0}^{n} r_j x^j \in R[x]$ and hence $F^1_*(f) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} F^1_*(r_j)F^1_*(x^j)$. For each $j\{0, ..., n\}$, there exist $\{r_{(j,\delta)} \in R|\delta \in \Delta\}$ and $u_j, t_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $j = u_j p + t_j$ where $0 \leq t_j < p$ and $F^1_*(r_j) = \sum_{\delta\in\Delta} r_{(j,\delta)}F^1_*(\delta)$. Therefore,

$$F^1_*(f) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} F^1_*(r_j)F^1_*(x^j) = \sum_{j=0}^{n}\sum_{\delta\in\Delta} r_{(j,\delta)}x^{u_j}F^1_*(\delta x^{t_j})$$

and $\{F^1_*(\delta x^t)|\delta \in \Delta \text{ and } t \in \{0, ..., p-1\}\}$ is a generating set of $F^1_*(R[x])$ as $R[x]$-module.
3) Let I be the ideal generated by x in $R[x]$ and let $A = R[x]$. Since $F^1_*(A)$ is finitely generated A-module, it follows by [15, Theorem] that $F^1_*(A) \otimes_A \widehat{A}_I$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{F^1_*(A)}_I$ as $\widehat{A}_I$-module and consequently $\widehat{F^1_*(A)}_I$ is finitely generated $\widehat{A}_I$-module. Now apply Lemma 2.5. □

For every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, let $R^{p^e} = \{r^{p^e}|r \in R\}$. It is obvious that R^{p^e} is a subring of R and the following corollary is equivalent to the definition 2.7.

Corollary 2.9 *A ring R is said to be F-finite if R is finitely generated R^p-module (or equivalently that R is finitely generated R^{p^e}-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$)*

Corollary 2.10 *Let M be a finitely generated R-module. If R is F-finite, then $F^e_*(M)$ is a finitely generated R-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let B be a generating set of M as R-module. If A is a generating set of R as an R^{p^e}-module, then it is easy to see that $\{F^e_*(ab)|a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$ is a generating set of $F^e_*(M)$ as a finitely generated R-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$ □

If R is any commutative ring (not necessarily of prime characteristic p), A non-zero R-module M is said to be decomposable provided that there exist non-zero R-modules M_1, M_2 such that $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$; otherwise M is indecomposable.

Recall that if M is a non-zero Noetherian module, then M is a direct sum (not necessarily unique) of finitely many indecomposable modules [3, Proposition 2.1, Example 2.3]. However, if M is a finitely generated module over a complete Noetherian local ring R (not necessarily of prime characteristic p) , by the Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem [6, Corollary 1.10], M can be written uniquely up to isomorphism as a direct sum of finitely many indecomposable R-modules. In another words, if M is a finitely generated module over a complete Noetherian local ring R, and If

$M \cong M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_s \approx N_1 \oplus ... \oplus N_t$, where the M_i and N_j are finitely generated indecomposable R-modules, then $s = t$ and, after renumbering, $M_i \cong N_i$ for each i.

As a result, if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is F-finite Noetherian local ring and M is a finitely generated R-module, then by [3, Proposition 2.1] M can be decomposed as $M \cong R^a \oplus N$ where a is a nonnegative integer and N is an R-module that has no free direct summand. The number a is unique and independent of the decomposition as when we take the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic completion, by the Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem a is uniquely determined. The number a is the maximal rank of a free direct summands of M and is denoted by $\sharp(M, R)$.

Furthermore, by Corollary 2.10, $F^e_*(M)$ is a finitely generated R-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and consequently $F^e_*(M)$ is Noetherian R-module for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, there exists a unique non-negative integer a_e and an R-module M_e that has no free direct summand such that $M \cong R^{a_e} \oplus M_e$. This proves the following corollary

Corollary 2.11 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an F-finite Noetherian local ring. If M is a finitely generated R-module, for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a unique nonnegative integer a_e such that $F^e_*(M) \cong R^{a_e} \oplus M_e$ where M_e has no non-zero free direct summand with the convention that $R^0 = \{0\}$. The number a_e is the maximal rank of free direct summand of the R-module $F^e_*(M)$*

Definition 2.12 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an F-finite Noetherian local ring. If M is a finitely generated R-module, the maximal rank of free direct summand of the R-module $F^e_*(M)$ is denoted by $\sharp(F^e_*(M), R)$.*

By [11, Corollry 5.2] we can define the F-pure ring as follows

Definition 2.13 *If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is an F-finite Noetherian local ring, then R is F-pure if $\sharp(F^1_*(R), R) > 0$ (equivalently, all $\sharp(F^e_*(R), R) > 0$ for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$).*

Recall that if I and J are two ideals of a ring R, then $(I : J)$ is the following ideal

$$(I : J) = \{r \in R | rJ \subseteq I\}$$

Richard Fedder in his paper [10] established the following criterion for the F-purity of a regular local ring of characteristic p.

Proposition 2.14 *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring of characteristic p and let $R = S/I$ where I is an ideal of S. Then R is F-pure if and only if $(I^{[p]} : I) \nsubseteq \mathfrak{m}^{[p]}$*

2.2 The Cokernl of Matrix

Notation 2.15 *If $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $M_{m\times n}(R)$ (and $M_n(R)$) denote the set of all $m \times n$ (and $n \times n$) matrices over a ring R. If $A \in M_{n\times m}(R)$ is the matrix representing the R-linear map $\phi : R^n \longrightarrow R^m$ that is given by $\phi(X) = AX$ for all $X \in R^n$, then we write $A : R^n \longrightarrow R^m$ to denotes the R-linear map ϕ and $\mathrm{Cok}_R(A)$ denotes the cokernl of ϕ while $\mathrm{Im}_R(A)$ denotes the image of ϕ. We write $\mathrm{Cok}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(A)$ if R is known from the context.*

Definition 2.16 *If $A, B \in M_n(R)$ where R is a commutative ring, we say that A is equivalent to B if there exist invertible matrices $U, V \in M_n(R)$ such that $A = UBV$.*

It is easy to see the following remark.

Remark 2.17 *1) If $A \in M_{n\times m}(R)$ and $B \in M_{s\times t}(R)$, then we define $A \oplus B$ to be the matrix in $M_{(n+s)\times(m+t)}(R)$ that is given by $A \oplus B = \begin{bmatrix} A & \\ & B \end{bmatrix}$. In this case,* $\mathrm{Cok}_R(A \oplus B) = \mathrm{Cok}_R(A) \oplus \mathrm{Cok}_R(B)$

2) If $A, B \in M_n(R)$ are equivalent matrices , then $\mathrm{Cok}_R(A)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_R(B)$ as R-modules.

If A and B are matrices in $M_n(R)$ such that $\mathrm{Cok}_R(A)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_R(B)$, it is not true in general that this implies that A is equivalent to B [14]. However, the following lemma gives partial converse of 2) in Remark 2.17.

Lemma 2.18 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a noetherian local ring and let $A \in M_s(R)$ and $B \in M_t(R)$ be two matrices determining the R-linear maps $A : R^s \to R^s$ and $B : R^t \to R^t$ such that A and B are injective and all entries of A and B are in $\mathfrak{m}$. If $\mathrm{Cok}_R(A)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_R(B)$ as R-modules, then $s = t$ and A is equivalent to B.*

Proof. Consider the following diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & R^t & \xrightarrow{B} & R^t & \xrightarrow{\delta} & Cok_R(B) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \beta\downarrow & & \alpha\downarrow & & \mu\downarrow\approx & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & R^s & \xrightarrow{A} & R^s & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Cok_R(A) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

The projectivity of R^t generates the R-linear map α that makes the right square of the diagram commutes. Since $\mathrm{Im}(\alpha B) \subseteq \mathrm{Im}(A)$, the projectivity of R^t generates β that makes the diagram commutative. The fact that all entries of A are in $\mathfrak{m}$ yields that $\mathrm{Im}(A) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}R^s$. Now, if $y \in R^s$, there exists $x \in R^t$ such that $\pi(y) = \mu\delta(x) = \pi\alpha(x)$. Therefore, $y - \alpha(x) \in \mathrm{Ker}(\pi) = \mathrm{Im}(A)$ and then $y \in \mathrm{Im}(\alpha) + \mathrm{Im}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Im}(\alpha) + \mathfrak{m}R^s$. This implies that $R^s = \mathrm{Im}(\alpha) + \mathfrak{m}R^s$ and hence by Nakayamma lemma it follows that α is a surjective R-linear. The surjectivity of α shows that $t \geq s$. By similar argument we show that $s \geq t$ and hence $s = t$. Since $\alpha : R^s \to R^s$ is surjective, α is isomorphism [15, Theorem 2.4]. The five lemma confirms that β is isomorphism too. If U and V are the invertible matrices representing α and β respectively, then $UB = AV$ as desired.

□

Notation 2.19 *Let R be a ring and m and n positive integers. If $\lambda \in A$, $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, then $L_{i,j}^{m\times n}(\lambda)$ denotes the $m \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is λ and the rest are all zeros. If $m = n$, we write $L_{i,j}^{n}(\lambda)$ (or $L_{i,j}(\lambda)$ if there is no ambiguity) instead of $L_{i,j}^{m\times n}(\lambda)$. When $k \neq m$, then $E_{k,m}(\lambda) := I + L_{k,m}(\lambda)$ where I is the identity matrix in $M_n(R)$.*

It is easy to observe the following remark

Remark 2.20 *Let n be a positive integer, $k, m \in \{1, ..., n\}$ with $k \neq m$. If $\lambda \in R$ and $A \in M_n(R)$, then :*
1) $E_{k,m}(\lambda)A$ is the matrix produced from A by adding λ times row m to row k.
2) $AE_{k,m}(\lambda)$ is the matrix produced from A by adding λ times column k to row m.

Let $\mathfrak{P}$ denote a ring with identity that is not necessarily commutative.

Lemma 2.21 *Let m be an integer with $m \geq 2$ and $n = 2m$. If A is a matrix in*

$M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ that is given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & & x \\ 0 & b & & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & b & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

then there exist two invertible matrices $M, N \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ satisfying that:
1) M has the form

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & M' \\ & I_{2(m-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where I_2 and $I_{2(m-1)}$ are the identity matrices in $M_2(\mathfrak{P})$ and $M_{2(m-1)}(\mathfrak{P})$ respectively, and M' is $2 \times 2(m-1)$ matrices over $\mathfrak{P}$.
2)N has the form

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & a_{1,3} & & \dots & & a_{1,n} \\ & 1 & 0 & a_{2,4} & & & \\ & & 1 & 0 & & & \vdots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-2,n} \\ & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

3)

$$MAN = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & x \\ 0 & 0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. By indiction on m, we will prove the result. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & b & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

First, Multiply the third row by $-b$ and add it to the first row after that multiply the first column by $-b$ and add it to the third column. Second, multiply the fourth row by $-b$ and add it to the second row after that multiply the second column by $-b$ and add it to the fourth column. It follows by remark 2.20 that

$$E_{2,4}(-b)E_{1,3}(-b)AE_{1,3}(-b)E_{2,4}(-b) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -b^2 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -b^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Taking $M = E_{2,4}(-b)E_{1,3}(-b)$ and $N = E_{1,3}(-b)))E_{2,4}(-b)$ yields that

$$M = N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -b \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now let $n = 2(m+1)$ and let A be the $n \times n$ matrix that is given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & & x \\ 0 & b & & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & b & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

Let $A^{'}$ be $2m \times 2m$ matrix that is given by

$$A^{'} = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & & \\ 0 & b & & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & b & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

We can write

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cc} & & & & 0 & x \\ & \grave{A} & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & & & & \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & b \end{array}\right]$$

By the induction hypothesis, there exist two matrices $M^{'}, N^{'} \in M_{2m}(\mathfrak{P})$ such that

$$M^{'}A^{'}N^{'} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

let B and C be $n \times n$ matrices, where $n = 2(m+1)$,that are given by $B = \begin{bmatrix} \grave{M} & \\ & I_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $C = \begin{bmatrix} \grave{N} & \\ & I_2 \end{bmatrix}$ where I_2 is the identity matrix in $M_2(\mathfrak{P})$.

As a result, it follows that

$$BAC = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccccc|cc}
0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & & 0 & & 0 & x \\
0 & 0 & & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & \\
 & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & \\
 & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & \\
 & & & 1 & 0 & & 0 & & & & \\
 & & & & 1 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & 1 & & 0 & b & \\
 & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 & b
\end{array}\right]$$

Now multiply the $(n-1)$-th row by $(-1)^m b^m$ and add it to the first row and then multiply the $(n-3)$-th column by $-b$ and add it to the $(n-1)$-th column. After that, multiply the n-th row by $(-1)^m b^m$ and add it to the second row and then multiply the $(n-2)$-th column by $-b$ and add it to the n-th column. It follows that

$$MAN = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & & & & & & (-1)^m b^{m+1} & & x \\
0 & 0 & & & & & & & (-1)^m b^{m+1} \\
1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & \\
 & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\
 & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & \\
 & & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & & \\
 & & & & & 1 & 0 & & 0
\end{array}\right]$$

where $M = E_{2,n}((-1)^m b^m) E_{1,n-3}((-1)^m b^m) B$ and $N = C E_{n-3,n-1}(-b) E_{n-2,n}(-b)$. It is clear from the construction of the matrices B and C and from the above remark that M and N are on the required forms that satisfy the result. $\square$

Corollary 2.22 *Let $n = 2m + 1$ where m is an integer with $m \geq 2$ and let A be a matrix in $M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ given by*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & x & 0 \\ 0 & b & & & & & y \\ 1 & 0 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & b & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

Then there exist invertible matrices M and N in $M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ such that

$$MAN = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & x & (-1)^m b^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & & & & (-1)^{m-1} b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} & y \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. Let A' be the $2m \times 2m$ matrix given by

$$A' = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & & x \\ 0 & b & & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & b & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

It follows that

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|c} & & & & & 0 \\ & & & & & y \\ & & A' & & & 0 \\ & & & & & \vdots \\ & & & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & b \end{array}\right]$$

By Lemma 2.21 there exist $2m \times 2m$ matrices M' and N' such that

$$M' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & x \\ 0 & 0 & & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Let B and C be the matrices in $M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ given by

$$B = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & 0 \\ & M' & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right] \text{ and } C = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & 0 \\ & N' & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

As a result, it follows that

$$BAC = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccc|c} 0 & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & y \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & & 1 & & 0 & b \end{array}\right]$$

Now multiply the last row of BAC by $(-1)^m b^m$ and add it to the first row after that multiply the $(n-2)$-th column of BAC by $-b$ and add it to the last column. This produces the required result. Indeed, if $M = E_{1,n}((-1)^m b^m)B$ and $N = CE_{n-2,n}$, we get that M and N are invertible matrices satisfying that

$$MAN = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & & & & & x & (-1)^m b^{m+1} \\ 0 & 0 & & & & (-1)^{m-1}b^m & y \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

Lemma 2.23 *Let n be an integer with $n \geq 2$. If $A \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ is given by*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

there exist upper triangular matrices $B, C \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ such that the (i,i) entry of B and C is the identity element of $\mathfrak{P}$ for all $i = 1, ..., n$ and

$$BAC = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & (-1)^{n+1}b^n \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof.

Now by induction on $n \geq 2$, we will prove this lemma. If $A = \begin{bmatrix} b & \\ 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$, then $E_{1,2}(-b)AE_{1,2}(-b) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (-1)^3b^2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ as required. Let A be a matrix in $M_{n+1}(\mathfrak{P})$ that is given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

If $A^{'} \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ is the matrix

$$A^{'} = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

It follows that A can be written as

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & 0 \\ & A^{'} & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 1 & b \end{array}\right]$$

By the induction hypothesis, there exist upper triangular matrices $B^{'}, C^{'} \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ such that the (i,i) entry of R and C is the identity element of A for all $i = 1, ..., n$ and

$$B^{'}A^{'}C^{'} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & (-1)^{n+1}b^n \\ 1 & 0 & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Let

$$M = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & 0 \\ & B' & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 \; 0 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

and

$$N = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & 0 \\ & C' & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 \; 0 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

As a result, it follows that

$$MAN = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|c} 0 & & & & (-1)^{n+1}b^n & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & & & 0 & 1 & b \end{array}\right]$$

Now if $B = E_{1,n+1}((-1)^{n+2}b^n)M$ and $C = NE_{n,n+1}(-b)$, then B and C are upper triangular matrices in $M_{n+1}(A)$ such that the (i,i) entry of B and C is the identity element of R for all $i = 1, ..., n+1$ and

$$BAC = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & (-1)^{n+2}b^{n+1} \\ 1 & 0 & & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & 1 & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

□

Lemma 2.24 *Let n be an element in $\mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. If $B \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ is given by*

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & & y \\ 1 & b & & & & \\ & 1 & b & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

,then the matrix B is equivalent to the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & y + (-1)^{n+1}b^n \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. Let B be a matrix in $M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ with $n \geq 2$. If $n = 2$, it is clear. Now assume that $n > 2$ and let

$$\grave{B} = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$$

Then B have the following form

$$B = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c} & & & & y \\ & \grave{B} & & & \vdots \\ & & & & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & b \end{array}\right]$$

Now use 2.23 and appropriate row and column operations to get the result. □

Lemma 2.25 *Let n be a positive integer such that $n \geq 3$, $k \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$ and let $m = n - k$. Suppose that u and v are two variables on $\mathfrak{P}$ and let $A_1^{(k)} \in M_k(\mathfrak{P})$ and $A_2^{(k)} \in M_m(\mathfrak{P})$ be given by $A_1^{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$ and $A_2^{(k)} =$*

$$\begin{bmatrix} b & & & & \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $B_k = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_1^{(k)} & L_{1,m}^{k\times m}(v) \\ \hline L_{1,k}^{k\times m}(u) & A_2^{(k)} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|ccccc} b & & & & & & & & & v \\ 1 & b & & & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ & & & 1 & b & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & u & b & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & b & & & \\ & & & & & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & & & & 1 & b \end{array}\right]$, *then* B_k *is equivalent to the matrix*

$$C_k = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} I_{n-2} & & \\ \hline & (-1)^{k+1}b^k & v \\ & u & (-1)^{m+1}b^m \end{array}\right] \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$$

where I_{n-2} *is the identity matrix in* $M_{n-2}(\mathfrak{P})$.

Moreover, if $D \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ *is given by* $D = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & uv \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$, *the* D *is equivalent to the matrix* $\grave{D} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} I_{n-2} & & \\ \hline & (-1)^n b^n & uv \\ & 1 & b \end{array}\right] \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ *where* I_{n-2} *is the identity matrix in* $M_{n-2}(\mathfrak{P})$

Proof. By Lemma 2.23, there exist upper triangular matrices $B_1, C_1 \in M_k(\mathfrak{P})$ and $B_2, C_2 \in M_{n-k}(\mathfrak{P})$ with 1 along their diagonal such that

$$B_1 A_1^{(k)} C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & (-1)^{k+1} b^k \\ 1 & 0 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } B_2 A_2^{(k)} C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & (-1)^{m+1} b^m \\ 1 & 0 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $m = n - k$. Define $B, C \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ to be $B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $C = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 \end{bmatrix}$.

We have

$$BB_kC = \begin{bmatrix} B_1A_1^{(k)}C_1 & L_{1,m}^{k\times m}(v) \\ L_{1,k}^{k\times m}(u) & B_2A_2^{(k)}C_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} 0 & & & (-1)^{k+1}b^k & & & v \\ 1 & 0 & & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 1 & 0 & & & \\ \hline & & & u & 0 & & (-1)^{m+1}b^m \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & & 1 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

Switching columns and rows of BB_kC yields the following equivalent matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|cc} I_{n-2} & & \\ \hline & (-1)^{k+1}b^k & v \\ & u & (-1)^{m+1}b^m \end{array}\right] \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$$

where I_{n-2} is the identity matrix in $M_{n-2}(\mathfrak{P})$.

A similar argument shows that the matrix $D = \begin{bmatrix} b & & & & uv \\ 1 & b & & & \\ & 1 & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & b \end{bmatrix}$ is equivalent

to the matrix $\grave{D} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} I_{n-2} & & \\ \hline & (-1)^n b^n & uv \\ & 1 & b \end{array}\right] \in M_n(\mathfrak{P})$ where I_{n-2} is the identity matrix in $M_{n-2}(\mathfrak{P})$ □

□

2.3 Maximal Cohen Maculay Modules

Throughout this section, Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. Recall that an element $r \in R$ is called a zerodevisor on M if there exists a nonzero element $m \in M$ such that $rm = 0$. An element $r \in R$ is said to be nonzerodivisor on M if r is not a zerodivisor on M, i.e. for every $m \in M - \{0\}$ it follows that $rm \neq 0$.

Definition 2.26 *An element r of R is said to be M-regular if $rM \neq M$ and r is a nonzerodivisor on M. The sequence $r_1, ..., r_n$ is M-regular if $M \neq (r_1, ..., r_n)M$, r_1 is a nonzerodivisor on M, and r_i a nonzerodivisor on $M/(r_1, ..., r_{i-1})M$ for every $2 \leq i \leq n$. If $r_1, ..., r_n$ is a sequence in an ideal $I \subseteq R$, then n is called the length of this sequence and the sequence $r_1, ..., r_n$ is called a maximal sequence in I if $r_1, ..., r_n, r$ is not a sequence on M for any $r \in I$.*

we can easily observe the following remark

Remark 2.27 *If $r_1, ..., r_n$ is a sequence on M, then $r_1^{k_1}, ..., r_n^{k_n}$ is a sequence on M for every positive integers $k_1, ..., k_n$. In particular case, if R has a prime characteristic p and $r_1, ..., r_n$ is a sequence on M, then $r_1, ..., r_n$ is a sequence on $F_*^e(M)$ for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$.*

It is well known [19, Corollary 19.1.4] that any two maximal M-regular sequences in an ideal $I \subseteq R$ have the same length. This enables us to provide this definition.

Definition 2.28 *Let I be an ideal of R with $IM \neq M$. The I-depth of M that is denoted by $depth_I M$ is the length of any maximal M-regular sequence in I. If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a Noetherian local ring and M is a nonzero finitely generated R-module (so that $\mathfrak{m}M \neq M$ by Nakayama) then the $\mathfrak{m}$-depth of M is called simply the depth of M, and in this case it is also denoted by $depthM$.*

Recall that the dimension of an R-module M, that is denoted by $dim_R M$ or $dimM$, is the dimension of the ring $R/AnnM$ where $AnnM$ is the ideal $Ann(M) = \{r \in R | rM = 0\}$.

Definition 2.29 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring and let M be a finitely generated R-module. M is a Cohen Macaulay module if $M = 0$ or $depthM = dimM$. If $depthM = dimR$, then M is called Maximal Cohen Macaulay module (MCM). In particular, R is a Maximal Cohen Macaulay ring if R is a Maximal Cohen Macaulay as R-module.*

The following Proposition describe the behaviour of the depth along exact sequences.

Proposition 2.30 *[4, Proposition 1.2.9] Let $0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$ be an exact sequence of finite R-modules. If $I \subseteq R$ is an ideal, then:*
1) $depth_I(M) \geq \min\{depth_I(U), depth_I(N)\}$
2) $depth_I(U) \geq \min\{depth_I(M), depth_I(N) + 1\}$
3) $depth_I(N) \geq \min\{depth_I(U) - 1, depth_I(M)\}$

This proposition leads to the following corollary

Corollary 2.31 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring. If U and N are finitely generated R-modules, then the R-module $U \oplus N$ is MCM if and only if U and N are both MCM R-modules.*

Proof. Let M be the R-module $U \oplus N$. Then we have the following short exact sequence

$$0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$$

If U and N are both MCM R-modules, it follows that $depthN = depthU = dimR$. Since $depthM \leq dimR$, by 1) in Proposition 2.30 it follows that

$$dimR = \min\{depthU, depthN\} \leq depthM \leq dimR$$

Therefore, $depthM = dimR$ and consequently M is MCM R-module.
Now assume that $M = U \oplus N$ is MCM R-module. First we will show that $depthU = depthN$. Assume that $depthU < depthN$. Since

$$0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$$

is a short exact sequence, by 2) of Proposition 2.30 it follows that

$$\min\{depthM, depthN + 1\} \leq depthU$$

If $depthN + 1 = \min\{depthM, depthN + 1\}$, then $depthN + 1 \leq depthU < depthN$ which is absurd. This makes

$$dimR = depthM = \min\{depthM, depthN + 1\} \leq depthU < depthN$$

which is absurd too. Therefore, the assumption that $depthU < depthN$ is impossible and we conclude that $depthN \leq depthU$. Using the fact that $0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$ is a short exact sequence and similar argument as above we conclude that $depthU \leq depthN$ and consequently $depthU = depthN$. Now the fact that $0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$ is a short exact sequence yields again by 2) of Proposition 2.30 that

$$\min\{depthM, depthN + 1\} \leq depthU$$

and consequently

$$dimR = depthM = \min\{depthM, depthN + 1\} \leq depthU = depthN \leq dimR$$

. This shows that $dimR = depthM = depthU = depthN$ as desired.

□

An easy induction yields the following corollary

Corollary 2.32 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring. If $M_1, ..., M_n$ are finitely generated R-modules then the R-module $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} M_i$ is MCM if and only if M_i is MCM for every $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$*

Definition 2.33 *Let R be any commutative ring. A non-zero R-module M is decomposable provided there exist non-zero R-modules M_1, M_2 such that $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$; otherwise M is indecomposable. If M is an R-module that does not have a direct summand isomorphic to R, we say that M is stable R-module.*

A ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is said to have finite Cohen-Macaulay type (or finite CM type) if there are, up to isomorphism, only finitely many indecomposable MCM R-modules.

Definition 2.34 *The ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is said to have finite Cohen-Macaulay type (or finite CM type) if there are, up to isomorphism, only finitely many indecomposable MCM R-modules.*

In 1957, Auslander and Buchsbaum introduced a formula that relates the projective dimension of an R-module M , denoted by $Pd_R M$ or PdM, with $depthM$ and $depthR$ as follows

Proposition 2.35 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring and M a nonzero finitely generated R-module. If $Pd_R M < \infty$, then*

$$PdM + depthM = depthR$$

Chapter 3

Matrix Factorization

In this chapter, we discuss the concept of a Matrix factorization and many basic properties that we need later in the rest of this paper.

Matrix factorizations were introduced by David Eisenbud in [7] as a means of compactly describing the minimal free resolutions of stable maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules over a local hypersurface ring.

3.1 Definitions and Properties

Definition 3.1 *[9, Definition 1.2.1] Let f be a nonzero element of a commutative ring S.*

A matrix factorization of f is a pair (ϕ, ψ) of homomorphisms between finitely generated free S-modules $\phi : G \to F$ and $\psi : F \to G$, such that $\psi\phi = fI_G$ and $\phi\psi = fI_F$.

Corollary 3.2 *Let f be a nonzero element of a commutative ring S. If $(\phi : G \to F, \psi : F \to G)$ is a matrix factorization of f, then: 1) $f \operatorname{Cok}(\phi) = f \operatorname{Cok}(\psi) = 0$.*
2) If f is a non-zerodivisor, then ϕ and ψ are injective.
3) If S is a domain, then G and F are finitely generated free modules having the same rank.

Proof. 1) Since $\psi\phi = fI_G$ and $\phi\psi = fI_F$, it follows that $fG \subseteq \operatorname{Im}(\psi)$ and $fF \subseteq \operatorname{Im}(\phi)$ which proves the result.

2) Let $x \in G$ such that $\phi(x) = 0$. This makes $fx = \psi(\phi(x)) = 0$. Since f is a non-zerodivisor, it follows that $x = 0$ and hence ϕ is injective. By similar argument, we prove that ψ is injective.
3) If $M = \mathrm{Cok}(\phi)$, then the following short sequence is exact

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{\phi} F \to M \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.1}$$

Recall that the rank of the finitely generated module M over the domain S, denoted by $rank_S M$, is the maximum number of S-linearly independent elements of M [5, Page 460]. If K is the quotient field of the integral domain S, the rank M equals the dimension of the vector space $K \otimes_S M$ over K [5, Excercise 20 Page471]. We know that $K \otimes_S M$ is isomorphic to $W^{-1}M$ as S-module where $W = S - \{0\}$. Since $fM = 0$, it follows that $K \otimes_S M = 0$. Therefore, tensoring the short exact sequence 3.1 with K over S yields that $K \otimes_S G \simeq K \otimes_S F$ and thus G and F have the same rank as free S-modules. □

As a result, we can define the matrix factorization of a nonzero element f in a domain as the following.

Definition 3.3 *Let S be a domain and let $f \in S$ be a nonzero element. A matrix factorization is a pair (ϕ, ψ) of $n \times n$ matrices with coefficients in S such that $\psi\phi = \phi\psi = fI_n$ where I_n is the identity matrix in $M_n(S)$. By $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ and $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi, \phi)$, we mean $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi)$ and $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi)$ respectively. There are two distinguished trivial matrix factorizations of any element f, namely $(f, 1)$ and $(1, f)$. Note that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(1, f) = 0$, while $\mathrm{Cok}_S(f, 1) = S/fS$. Two matrix factorizations (ϕ, ψ) and (α, β) of f are said to be equivalent and we write $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$ if $\phi, \psi, \alpha, \beta \in M_n(S)$ for some positive integer n and there exist invertible matrices $V, W \in M_n(S)$ such that $V\phi = \alpha W$ and $W\psi = \beta V$. If $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ is a regular local ring, a matrix factorization (ϕ, ψ) of an element $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$ is reduced if all entries of ϕ and ψ are in $\mathfrak{m}$.*

We can easily notice the following remark:

Remark 3.4 *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring, $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$, $R = S/fS$ and let u, v and z be variables on S. Suppose that (ϕ, ψ) and (α, β) are two matrix factorizations of f. Then*
1) $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi)$ and $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi)$ are both modules over the ring R as $f \mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi) = 0$ and $f \mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi) = 0$.

2) If $\phi, \psi \in M_n(S)$, then the S-linear maps $\phi : S^n \to S^n$ and $\psi : S^n \to S^n$ are both injective.
3) If $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$, then $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$ over S (and consequently over R), likewise, $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi, \phi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\beta, \alpha)$ over S (and consequently over R)
4) If (ϕ, ψ) and (α, β) are reduced matrix factorizations of f such that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$, then by Lemma 2.18 and the definition of the matrix factorization it follows that $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$
5) We define $(\phi, \psi) \oplus (\alpha, \beta) := (\phi \oplus \alpha, \psi \oplus \beta)$ and $(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese} := \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi & -vI \\ uI & \psi \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \psi & vI \\ -uI & \phi \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and consequently $(\phi, \psi) \oplus (\alpha, \beta)$ is a matrix factorization of f and $(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese}$ is a matrix factorization for $f + uv$ in $S[[u, v]]$
6) If $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$, then $(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese} \sim (\alpha, \beta)^{\maltese}$
7)$[(\phi, \psi) \oplus (\alpha, \beta)]^{\maltese}$ is equivalent to $(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese} \oplus (\alpha, \beta)^{\maltese}$.
8) $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}[(\phi, \psi) \oplus (\alpha, \beta)]^{\maltese}$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese} \oplus \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha, \beta)^{\maltese}$
9) If $M = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ and $N = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\psi, \phi)$, we write $M^{\maltese} = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese}$ and $N^{\maltese} = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\psi, \phi)^{\maltese}$ (Notice here that the operation $(-)^{\maltese}$ depends on the the matrix factorization). As a result, $(M \bigoplus N)^{\maltese} = M^{\maltese} \bigoplus N^{\maltese}$. Furthermore, if $M_i = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_i, \psi_i)$ where (ϕ_i, ψ_i) is a matrix factorization of f for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, it follows that $(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} M_j)^{\maltese} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} M_j^{\maltese}$.
10) If $R^{\bigstar} = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$, we can write $(R)^{\maltese} = R^{\bigstar}$ as $R = \mathrm{Cok}_S(f, 1)$.
11) If $(\phi, \psi)^{\sharp} := \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi & -zI \\ zI & \psi \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \psi & zI \\ -zI & \phi \end{bmatrix} \right)$, then $(\phi, \psi)^{\sharp}$ is a matrix factorization of $f + z^2$ in $S[[z]]$.
12) If $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$, then $(\phi, \psi)^{\sharp} \sim (\alpha, \beta)^{\sharp}$
13)$[(\phi, \psi) \oplus (\alpha, \beta)]^{\sharp}$ is equivalent to $(\phi, \psi)^{\sharp} \oplus (\alpha, \beta)^{\sharp}$.
14) If $R^{\sharp} = S[[z]]/(f + z^2)$, then $R^{\sharp} = S[[z]]/(f + z^2) = \mathrm{Cok}(f, 1)^{\sharp} = \mathrm{Cok}(1, f)^{\sharp}$.

Proof. We will prove just 4) and 6) as the rest are obvious from the given definitions.
4) Assume that (ϕ, ψ) and (α, β) are reduced matrix factorizations of f such that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$. This means that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha)$ and consequently by by Lemma 2.18 it follows that $V\phi = \alpha W$ for invertible matrices V and W. Therefore, we have $V\phi\psi = \alpha W\psi$ and thus $V(fI) = \alpha W\psi$. As

a result, we get $\beta V(fI) = \beta\alpha W\psi = fIW\psi$ and consequently $f\beta V = fW\psi$. Since f is an element of the integral domain S, we conclude that $\beta V = W\psi$. This proves that (ϕ, ψ) is equivalent to (α, β).
6) Assume that $V\phi = \alpha W$ and $W\psi = \beta V$ for invertible matrices V and W. It follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} V & \\ & W \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi & -vI \\ uI & \psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -vI \\ uI & \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W & \\ & V \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} W & \\ & V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \psi & vI \\ -uI & \phi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & vI \\ -uI & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V & \\ & W \end{bmatrix}$$

This proves that the matrix factorization $\left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi & -vI \\ uI & \psi \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \psi & vI \\ -uI & \phi \end{bmatrix} \right)$ is equivalent to the matrix factorization $\left(\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -vI \\ uI & \beta \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \beta & vI \\ -uI & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and therefore $(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese} \sim (\alpha, \beta)^{\maltese}$ □

Any matrix factorization has a decomposition as follows

Proposition 3.5 *[25, Page58] Let (S, m) be a regular local ring and $f \in m - \{0\}$. Any matrix factorization (ϕ, ψ) of f can be written uniquely up to equivalence as*

$$(\phi, \psi) = (\alpha, \beta) \oplus (f, 1)^t \oplus (1, f)^u$$

with (α, β) reduced, i.e, all entries of α, β are in m, and with t, u nonnegative integers.

3.2 Matrix factorization and Maximal Cohen Macaulay modules

The importance of the concept of the matrix factorization in the subject of MCM modules appears clearly in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6 *[Prop. 8.3 in [6]]*

Let $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring and let f be a non-zero element of $\mathfrak{m}^2$ and $R = S/fS$.

(i) For every MCM R-module M, there is a matrix factorization (ϕ, ψ) of f with $\operatorname{Cok}\phi \cong M$.

(ii) If (ϕ, ψ) is a matrix factorization of f , then $\operatorname{Cok}\phi$ *and* $\operatorname{Cok}\psi$ *are MCM R-modules.*

Proof. Let $dimR = d$.

i) By [2, Corollary 11.8] it follows that $dimS = d + 1$. Notice that M can be viewed as S-module such that every M-regular sequence on R is M-regular sequence on S and every M-regular sequence on S is also M-regular sequence on R. As a result, $depth_S M = depth_R M$. Since M is finitely generated module over the regular local ring S, it follows by Auslander-Buchsbaum-Serre theorem [4, Theorem 2.2.7] that $Pd_S M < \infty$. Auslander-Buchsbaum formula implies that

$$Pd_S M = depthS - depth_S M = dimS - depth_R M = dimS - dimR = 1$$

Therefore, there exist projective S-modules F and G, and consequently they are free S-modules [19, Proposition 18.4.1], such that the following sequence is exact

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{\phi} F \xrightarrow{\lambda} M \longrightarrow 0$$

For each $x \in F$, we notice that $\lambda(fx) = 0$ and consequently $fM \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}\lambda = \operatorname{Im}\phi$. As ϕ is injective [Corollary 3.2], for each $x \in F$ there exists a unique element $y \in G$ such that $\phi(y) = fx$. This enables us to define a map $\psi : F \to G$ via $\psi(x) = y$ if and only if $\phi(y) = fx$. It is easy to check that ψ is an injective homomorphism over S satisfying that $\psi\phi = fI_G$ and $\psi\phi = fI_F$ where I_F and I_G denote the identity maps on F and G respectively. Therefore, $M = \operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi)$.

ii) If (ϕ, ψ) is a matrix factorization of f, then there exist two free S-modules F and G having the same rank and making the following short sequences exact over S

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{\phi} F \to \operatorname{Cok}\phi \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{\psi} F \to \operatorname{Cok}\psi \longrightarrow 0$$

This means that $Pd_S(\operatorname{Cok}\phi) = 1 = Pd_S(\operatorname{Cok}\psi)$. Since $depth_S S = dim S$, it follows by Auslander-Buchsbaum formula that

$$depth_R \operatorname{Cok}\phi = depth_S \operatorname{Cok}\phi = depth_S S - Pd_S(\operatorname{Cok}\phi) = dim S - 1 = dim R$$

and

$$depth_R \operatorname{Cok}\psi = depth_S \operatorname{Cok}\psi = depth_S S - Pd_S(\operatorname{Cok}\psi) = dim S - 1 = dim R$$

This proves that $\operatorname{Cok}\phi$ and $\operatorname{Cok}\psi$ are MCM R-modules □

Definition 3.7 *Let R be any commutative ring, a non-zero R-module M is decomposable provided there exist non-zero R-modules M_1, M_2 such that $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$; otherwise M is indecomposable. If M is an R-module that does not have a direct summand isomorphic to R, we say that M is stable R-module.*

Proposition 3.8 *[6, Theorem 8.30] Let $(S, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ be a complete regular local ring such that k is algebraically closed of characteristic not 2 and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - \{0\}$. let $R^\bigstar := S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$. The association $M \to M^{\maltese}$ defines a bijection between the isomorphisms classes of indecomposable non-free MCM modules over R and $R^\bigstar$*

Proposition 3.9 *[25, Corollary 7.6] [6, Theorem 8.7] Let $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring and let f be a non-zero element of $\mathfrak{m}$ and $R = S/fS$. Then the association $(\phi, \psi) \mapsto \operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi)$ yields a bijective correspondence between the set of equivalence classes of reduced matrix factorizations of f and the set of isomorphism classes of stable MCM modules over R .*

If M is a finitely generated module over a Noetherian local ring R, recall from the discussion coming after corollary 2.10 that $\sharp(M, R)$ denotes the maximal rank of free direct summand of the R-module M.

Corollary 3.10 *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring , $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$, $R = S/fS$, $R^\bigstar = S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$, and $R^\sharp = S[[z]]/(f+z^2)$ where u, v and z are variables over S . If (ϕ, ψ) is a matrix factorization of f having the decomposition*

$$(\phi, \psi) = (\alpha, \beta) \oplus (f, 1)^t \oplus (1, f)^r$$

such that (α, β) is reduced and t, r are nonnegative integers, then :
1) $\sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi), R) = t$ and $\sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\psi, \phi), R) = r$.
2) $\sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi)^{\maltese}, R^\bigstar) = \sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi), R) + \sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\psi, \phi), R)$
3) $\sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi)^\sharp, R^\sharp) = \sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\phi, \psi), R) + \sharp(\operatorname{Cok}(\psi, \phi), R)$

Proof. 1) It is obvious that $\mathrm{Cok}(f,1) = R$ but $\mathrm{Cok}(1,f) = \{0\}$ and hence $\mathrm{Cok}(\phi,\psi) = \mathrm{Cok}(\alpha,\beta) \oplus R^t$. Since (α,β) is reduced, it follows by Proposition 3.9that $\mathrm{Cok}(\alpha,\beta)$ is stable. This makes $\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}(\phi,\psi),R) = t$. Now, since $(\psi,\phi) = (\beta,\alpha)\oplus(f,1)^u \oplus (1,f)^t$, it follows by what we have proved that $\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}(\psi,\phi),R) = u$. 2) Notice by Remark 3.4 that $\mathrm{Cok}(f,1)^{\maltese} = R^{\bigstar} = \mathrm{Cok}(1,f)^{\maltese}$. This makes

$$\mathrm{Cok}(\phi,\psi)^{\maltese} = \mathrm{Cok}(\alpha,\beta)^{\maltese} \oplus (R^{\bigstar})^t \oplus (R^{\bigstar})^r$$

Since $(\alpha,\beta)^{\maltese}$ is a reduced matrix factorization of $f+uv$, it follows by Proposition 3.9 that $\mathrm{Cok}(\alpha,\beta)^{\maltese}$ is stable $R^{\bigstar}$-module. This proves that

$$\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}(\phi,\psi)^{\maltese}, R^{\bigstar}) = t + r = \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}(\phi,\psi),R) + \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}(\psi,\phi),R)$$

3) Similar argument to the above argument. □

Recall that if M is a non-zero Noetherian module, then M is a direct sum of finitely many indecomposable modules [3, Proposition 2.1]. As a result, if M is a finitely generated module over a complete notherian local ring R, by the Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem, M can be written uniquely up to isomorphism as a direct sum of finitely many indecomposable R-modules. This enables us to establish the following corollary

Corollary 3.11 *Let $(S,\mathfrak{m})$ be a regular local ring , $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$, and $R = S/fS$. If (ϕ,ψ) is a reduced matrix factorization of f, then*

$$(\phi,\psi) \sim [(\phi_1,\psi_1) \oplus (\phi_2,\psi_2) \oplus ... \oplus (\phi_n,\psi_n)]$$

where (ϕ_i,ψ_i) is a reduced matrix factorization of f with $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_i,\psi_i)$ is non-free indecomposable MCM R-module for all $i \in \{1,...,n\}$. Furthermore, if R is a complete notherian local ring, then the above representation of (ϕ,ψ) is unique up to equivalence.

Proof. Eisenboud's Theorem 3.9 implies that the MCM R-module $M := \mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi,\psi)$ is stable MCM R-module. We may assume that $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ where M_j is a nonfree indecomposable MCM R-module for each $j \in \{1,...,n\}$. Since every nonfree indecomposable module is stable, we conclude by 3.9 again that $M_j = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_j,\psi_j)$ for some reduced matrix factorization (ϕ_j,ψ_j) of f for all $j \in \{1,...,n\}$. As a result, $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi,\psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S[(\phi_1,\psi_1) \oplus (\phi_2,\psi_2) \oplus ... \oplus (\phi_n,\psi_n)]$ and by Remark 3.4(4) we get that $(\phi,\psi) \sim [(\phi_1,\psi_1) \oplus (\phi_2,\psi_2) \oplus ... \oplus (\phi_n,\psi_n)]$. If R is

a complete notherian local ring, then the above representation of M as a direct decomposition is unique up to isomorphism. Indeed, if $M = N_1 \oplus ... \oplus N_t$ where N_i is a nonfree indecomposable MCM R-module for each $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$,then by Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem $n = t$ and after renumbering M_j is isomorphic to N_j for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Since we can write $N_j = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ we conclude by Remark 3.4(4) that $(\phi_j, \psi_j) \sim (\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. □

Proposition 3.12 *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ be a complete regular local ring such that k is algebraically closed of characteristic not 2, and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - \{0\}$. let $R = S/fS$ and $R^\bigstar := S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. If (ϕ, ψ) and (α, β) are reduced matrix factorizations of f, then $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$ over R if and only if $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi, \psi)^\maltese$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha, \beta)^\maltese$ over $R^\bigstar$*

Proof. If $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$, by Remark 3.4(4), $(\phi, \psi) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$ and consequently $(\phi, \psi)^\maltese \sim (\alpha, \beta)^\maltese$. This shows that $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi, \psi)^\maltese$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha, \beta)^\maltese$ over $R^\bigstar$. Now by Corollary 3.11 $(\phi, \psi) \sim [(\phi_1, \psi_1) \oplus (\phi_2, \psi_2) \oplus ... \oplus (\phi_n, \psi_n)]$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \sim [(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \oplus (\alpha_2, \beta_2) \oplus ... \oplus (\alpha_t, \beta_t)]$ where (ϕ_i, ψ_i) and (α_j, β_j) are reduced matrix factorizations of f satisfying that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_i, \psi_i)$ and $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ are nonfree indecomposable MCM R-module for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. As a result, by Remark 3.11(6),(7), and (8) we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi, \psi)^\maltese = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_j, \psi_j)^\maltese$$

and

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha, \beta)^\maltese = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_i, \beta_i)^\maltese$$

Notice that by Proposition 3.8 that $Cok_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_j, \psi_j)^\maltese$ and $Cok_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_i, \beta_i)^\maltese$ are non-free indecomposable MCM $R^\bigstar$-module for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. Since $R^\bigstar$ is complete Noetherian local ring, we obtain by KRS theorem that $n = t$ and after renumbering $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_j, \psi_j)^\maltese = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_j, \beta_j)^\maltese$ for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Again, by Proposition 3.8 we conclude that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_j, \psi_j) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ and consequently by Remark 3.4(4) that $(\phi_j, \psi_j) \sim (\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. This yields that

$$(\phi, \psi) \sim \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} (\phi_j, \psi_j) \sim \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} (\alpha_j, \beta_j) \sim (\alpha, \beta)$$

Therefore we obtain that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi, \psi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha, \beta)$ as desired. □

Chapter 4

The finite F-representation type over hypersurfaces

This chapter will include the definition of the concept of finite F-representation type of a finitely generated R- module M and some examples and properties of this concept. If $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ or $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ where K is a field of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$ and $R = S/fS$ for some $f \in S$, we introduce in this chapter a presentation of $F^e_*(R)$ as a cokernel of a matrix factorization, denoted by $M_S(f, e)$, of f . The properties of this presentation and its applications to the concept of finite F-representation type will be considered in this chapter.

4.1 Rings of finite F-representation type

Definition 4.1 *[18, Definition 2.1]*

1) A finitely generated R-module M is said to have finite F-representation type (or has FFRT) by finitely generated R-modules M_1, ... , M_s if for every positive integer e, the R-module $F^e_*(M)$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of the R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$, that is, there exist nonnegative integers $t_{(e,1)}, \ldots, t_{(e,s)}$ such that

$$F^e_*(M) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} M_j^{\oplus t_{(e,j)}}$$

In particular case, R is said to have finite F-representation type if there exist finitely generated R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ by which R has finite F-representation type.
2) Let $R = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} R_n$ be a Noetherian graded ring of prime characteristic p. A finitely generated graded R-module M is said to have finite graded F-representation type by finitely generated $\mathbb{Q}$- graded R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ if for every positive integer e, the $\mathbb{Q}$-graded R-module $F^e_*(M)$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of the $\mathbb{Q}$-graded R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$, that is, there exist nonnegative integers t_{ei} and rational numbers $\alpha^{(e)}_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $1 \leq j \leq t_{ei}$ such that there exists a $\mathbb{Q}$-graded isomorphism of the form

$$F^e_*(M) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t_{ei}} M_i(\alpha^{(e)}_{ij})$$

In particular case, R is said to have finite graded F-representation type if there exist finitely generated $\mathbb{Q}$-graded R-modules $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ by which R has finite graded F-representation type.

S. Takagi and R. Takahashi exhibit in [21] examples of rings with finite F-representation type as follows:
Example. [21, Example1.3] R has finite F-representation type (resp. finite graded F-representation type) in the following cases:
(i) ([20, Observation 3.1.2]) R is an F-finite regular local ring of characteristic $p > 0$ (resp. a polynomial ring $k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ over a field k of characteristic $p > 0$ such that $[k : k^p] < \infty$).
(ii) ([20, Observation 3.1.3]) R is a Cohen-Macaulay local ring (resp. a Cohen-Macaulay graded ring) of prime characteristic p with finite representation type (resp. finite graded representation type).
(iii) (R, m, k) is an Artinian local ring of prime characteristic p (resp. $R = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} R_n$ is an Artinian graded ring with $k := R_0$ a field of characteristic $p > 0$) such that $[k : k^p] < \infty$. □
Example. Takafuni Shibuta in his paper [18] proved that a complete local or graded one-dimensional domain of prime characteristic has finite F-representation type if its residue field is algebraically closed or finite, and present examples [18, Example 3.3 and Example 3.4] of a complete local or graded one-dimensional domains which do not have finite F-representation type with a perfect residue field. □

Proposition 4.2 *Let R be Noetherian ring and M be a finitely generated R-module. Assume that M has FFRT on R. If W is a multiplicatively closed set and I is an ideal of R, then:*
1) $W^{-1}M$ has FFRT on $W^{-1}R$.
2) $\widehat{M_I}$ has FFRT on $\widehat{R}_I$

Proof. Suppose that M has FFRT by finitely generated R-modules M_1, ... , M_s. If $e \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exist nonnegative integers $n_{(e,1)}, \ldots, n_{(e,s)}$ such that

$$F_*^e(M) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} M_j^{\oplus n_{(e,j)}}$$

It follows by Lemma 2.4 that

$$F_*^e(W^{-1}M) = W^{-1}F_*^e(M) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} (W^{-1}M_j)^{\oplus n_{(e,j)}}$$

As a result, $W^{-1}M$ has FFRT on $W^{-1}R$ by the finitely generated $W^{-1}R$-modules $W^{-1}M_1$, ... , $W^{-1}M_s$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.5, we get that

$$F_*^e(\widehat{M_I}) = \widehat{F_*^e(M)}_I = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} (\widehat{(M_j)}_I)^{\oplus n_{(e,j)}}$$

Therefore, $\widehat{M_I}$ has FFRT on $\widehat{R}_I$ by the finitely generated $\widehat{R}_I$-modules $\widehat{M_{1I}}$, ... , $\widehat{M_{sI}}$. □

Recall that [2, Page 32] for any R-module M, $M[x]$ denotes the set of all polynomials in X with cofficents in M, that is to say expressions of the form

$$m_0 + m_1 x + ... + m_r x^r$$

where $m_k \in M$ for all k. Defining the product of an element of $R[x]$ and an element of $M[x]$ in the obvious way, then it follows that:

Remark 4.3 *1) $M[x]$ is an $R[x]$-module.*
2) $M[x]$ is isomorphic to $M \bigotimes_R R[x]$ as $R[x]$-modules.
3) if M is finitely generated R-module that is generated by $\{m_1, ..., m_n\}$. then $M[x]$ is finitely generated $R[x]$ -module that is generated by $\{m_1 \otimes_R 1, ..., m_n \otimes_R 1\}$

Discussion 4.4 *Let R be a commutative ring of positive prime characteristic p and let M be an R-module. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q = p^e$. We define*

$$F_*^e(M)[x] = \{\sum_{k=0}^{n} F_*^e(m_k)x^k | n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, F_*^e(m_k) \in F_*^e(M) \forall k\}$$

It is clear that $F_*^e(M)[X]$ is $R[x]$ module with scalar multiplication given as follows: If $m = \sum_{i=1}^{s} F_*^e(m_i)x^i \in F_*^e(M)[x]$ and $f = \sum_{j=1}^{t} r_j x^j \in R[x]$, then

$$fm = \sum_{j=0}^{t}\sum_{i=0}^{s} F^e(r_j^q m_i)x^{i+j}$$

Furthermore, $F_*^e(M)[x]$ is $F_*^e(R)[x]$ module with scalar multiplication given as follows: If $m = \sum_{i=1}^{s} F_*^e(m_i)x^i \in F_*^e(M)[x]$ and $f = \sum_{j=1}^{t} F_*^e(r_j)x^j \in F_*^e(R)[x]$, then

$$mf = \sum_{j=0}^{t}\sum_{i=0}^{s} F_*^e(r_j m_i)x^{i+j}$$

However, we define $F_*^e(M[x])$ as a different $R[x]$-module that can be considered also as $F^e(R[x])$-module as follows:

$$F_*^e(M[x]) = \{\sum_{k=0}^{n} F_*^e(m_k)F_*^e(x^k) | n \in \mathbb{N}, F_*^e(m_k) \in F_*^e(M) \forall k\}$$

$F_*^e(M[x])$ is $R[x]$ module with scalar multiplication given as follows: If $F_*^e(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} F_*^e(m_i)F_*^e(x^i) \in F_*^e(M[x])$ and $f = \sum_{j=1}^{t} r_j x^j \in R[x]$, then

$$fF_*^e(m) = \sum_{j=0}^{t}\sum_{i=0}^{s} F_*^e(r_j^q m_i)F_*^e(x^{i+qj})$$

Furthermore, $F_*^e(M[x])$ is $F_*^e(R[x])$-module with scalar multiplication given as follows: If $F_*^e(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} F_*^e(m_i)F_*^e(x^i) \in F_*^e(M[x])$ and $F_*^e(f) = \sum_{j=1}^{t} F_*^e(r_j)F_*^e(x^j) \in F_*^e(R[x])$, then

$$F_*^e(f)F_*^e(m) = \sum_{j=0}^{t}\sum_{i=0}^{s} F_*^e(r_j m_i)F_*^e(x^{i+j})$$

Proposition 4.5 *Let R be a Notherian ring of positive prime characteristic p and let M be a finitely generated R-module. If M has FFRT over R, then $M[x]$ has FFRT over $R[x]$*

Proof. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q = p^e$. If $f = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k x^k$ is in $M[x]$, then $F_*^e(f)$ is in $F_*^e(M[x])$ and is given by

$$F_*^e(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} F_*^e(m_k) F_*^e(x^k)$$

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist uniquely $c_k \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ and $b_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k = qb_k + c_k$ .Therefore

$$F_*^e(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} F_*^e(m_k) F_*^e(x^{qb_k + c_k}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} F_*^e(m_k) F_*^e(x^{c_k}) x^{b_k}$$

Since each c_k lies in $\{0, ..., q-1\}$, it follows that $F_*^e(f)$ can be written as

$$F_*^e(f) = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} F_*^e(x^j) f_j$$

where $f_j \in F_*^e(M)[x]$ for each $j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$

On the other hand, if $F_*^e(g) = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} g_j F_*^e(x^j)$ where $g_j \in F_*^e(M)[x]$, then $F_*^e(g) = 0$ if and only if $g_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$. Therefore,

$$F_*^e(M[x]) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{q-1} F_*^e(x^j) F_*^e(M)[x]$$

However, the $R[x]$-module $F_*^e(x^j) F_*^e(M)[x]$ is isomorphic to $F_*^e(M)[x]$ as $R[x]$-modules. Indeed, for each $f \in F_*^e(M)[x]$ define $\phi(f) = F_*^e(x^j) f$. This makes $\phi : F_*^e(M)[x] \to F_*^e(x^j) F_*^e(M)[x]$ an isomorphism of $R[x]$-modules. Therefore,

$$F_*^e(M[x]) = F_*^e(M)[x]^{\oplus q}$$

Since M has FFRT, there exist finitely generated R-modules $M_1, ..., M_s$ and non-negative integers $n_{(e,1)}, ..., n_{(e,s)}$ such that

$$F_*^e(M) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} M_j^{\oplus n_{(e,j)}}$$

Tensoring with $R[x]$ both sides of the above equality and using Fact 1 above yield that

$$F_*^e(M)[x] = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} (M_j[x])^{\oplus n_{(e,j)}}$$

As a result, it follows that

$$F_*^e(M[x]) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} (M_j[x])^{\oplus qn_{(e,j)}}$$

This shows that $M[x]$ has FFRT by the finitely generated $R[x]$-modules $M_1[x], ..., M_s[x]$. □

Corollary 4.6 *Let R be a Notherian ring of prime characteristic p. If R has FFRT, then:*
1) $R[x]$ has FFRT over $R[x]$.
2) $R[[x]]$ has FFRT over $R[[x]]$

Proof. 1) This is a particular case of Proposition 4.11.
2) Recall that If $I = (x)R[x]$, then $\widehat{R[x]}_I = R[[x]]$ [8, Page 183]. Apply the above result and Proposition 4.2. □

4.2 The presentation of $F_*^e(S/fS)$ as a cokernel of a Matrix Factorization of f

Throughout the rest of this work, unless otherwise mentioned, we will adapt the following notation:

Notation 4.7 *K will denote a field of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$, and we set $q = p^e$ for some $e \in \mathbb{N}$. S will denote the ring $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ or $(K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]])$. If Λ is the basis of K as K^p-vector space, then $\Lambda_e = \{\lambda_1\lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_e \,|\, \lambda_j \in \Lambda$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., e\}\}$ is a basis of K as K^{p^e}-vector space. We set*

$$\Delta_e := \{\lambda x_1^{a_1} ... x_n^{a_n} \,|\, 0 \leq a_i \leq p^e - 1 \text{ for all } i \in \{1, ..., n\} \text{ and } \lambda \in \Lambda_e\}$$

and set $r_e := |\Delta_e| = [K : K^p]^e q^n$

Discussion 4.8 *It is well known that $F_*^e(S)$ is a free S-module with basis $\{F_*^e(j) \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$. As a result, if $f \in S$ and $j \in \Delta_e$, there exists uniquely a set $\{f_{(i,j)} \in S \,|\, i \in \Delta_e\}$ such that $F_*^e(jf) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e(i)$. The $r_e \times r_e$ matrix $[f_{(i,j)}]$ that is indexed by Δ_e is called the matrix of relations of f over S with respect to e and it is denoted by $M_S(f, e)$ or $M(f, e)$ if S is known.*

Example. Let K be a perfect field of prime characteristic 3 , $S = K[x, y]$ or $S = k[[x, y]]$ and let $f = x^2 + xy$. We aim to construct $M_S(f, 1)$. Since the set $\{F^1_*(1), F^1_*(x), F^1_*(x^2), F^1_*(y), F^1_*(yx), F^1_*(yx^2), F^1_*(y^2), F^1_*(y^2x), F^1_*(y^2x^2)\}$ is the basis of $F^1_*(S)$ as S-module, we get that
$F^1_*(f) = F^1_*(x^2 + xy) = F^1_*(x^2) + F^1_*(yx)$
$F^1_*(xf) = F^1_*(x^3 + x^2y) = xF^1_*(1) + F^1_*(x^2y)$
$F^1_*(x^2f) = F^1_*(x^4 + x^3y) = xF^1_*(x) + xF^1_*(y)$
$F^1_*(yf) = F^1_*(yx^2 + xy^2) = F^1_*(yx^2) + F^1_*(y^2x)$
$F^1_*(yxf) = F^1_*(yx^3 + x^2y^2) = xF^1_*(y) + F^1_*(y^2x^2)$
$F^1_*(yx^2f) = F^1_*(yx^4 + x^3y^3) = xF^1_*(yx) + xF^1_*(y^2)$
$F^1_*(y^2f) = F^1_*(y^2x^2 + xy^3) = F^1_*(y^2x^2) + yF^1_*(x)$
$F^1_*(y^2xf) = F^1_*(y^2x^3 + x^2y^3) = xF^1_*(y^2) + yF^1_*(x^2)$
$F^1_*(y^2x^2f) = F^1_*(y^2x^4 + x^3y^3) = xF^1_*(y^2x) + xyF^1_*(1)$
Therefore,

$$M_S(f,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & yx \\ 0 & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & y & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x & 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

□

Remark 4.9 *If $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $F^e_*(f^{mq}j) = f^m F^e_*(j)$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$. This makes $M_S(f^{mq}, e) = f^m I$ where I is the identity matrix of size $r_e \times r_e$.*

Proposition 4.10 *If $f, g \in S$, then*
1) $M_S(f + g, e) = M_S(f, e) + M_S(g, e)$

2) $M_S(fg,e) = M_S(g,e)M_S(f,e)$ *and consequently* $M_S(f,e)M_S(g,e) = M_S(g,e)M_S(f,e)$
3) $M_S(f^m,e) = [M_S(f,e)]^m$ *for all* $m \in \mathbb{N}$

Proof. Since $\{F_*^e(j)|j \in \Delta_e\}$ is a basis of $F_*^e(S)$ as S-module, for each $j \in \Delta_e$ there exits uniquely a set $\{f_{(i,j)} \in S|j \in \Delta_e\}$ and a set $\{g_{(i,j)} \in S|j \in \Delta_e\}$ such that $F_*^e(jf) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)}F_*^e(i)$ and $F_*^e(jg) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_{(i,j)}F^e(i)$.
Therefore

$$F_*^e(j(f+g)) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e}(f_{(i,j)} + g_{(i,j)})F_*^e(i)$$

Consequently

$$M_S(f+g,e) = [f_{(i,j)} + g_{(i,j)}] = [f_{(i,j)}] + [g_{(i,j)}] = M_S(f,e) + M_S(g,e)$$

Now, if $h = fg$, there exits uniquely a set $\{h_{(k,j)} \in S|k \in \Delta_e\}$ such that

$$F_*^e(jfg) = F_*^e(jh) = \sum_{k\in\Delta_e} h_{(k,j)}F_*^e(k)$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^e(jfg) &= F_*^e(jf)F_*^e(g) \\ &= \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)}F_*^e(ig) \\ &= \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} \sum_{k\in\Delta_e} g_{(k,i)}F_*^e(k) \\ &= \sum_{k\in\Delta_e}(\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_{(k,i)}f_{(i,j)})F_*^e(k) \end{aligned}$$

This makes $h_{(k,j)} = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_{(k,i)}f_{(i,j)}$ for all $k, j \in \Delta_e$ and consequently

$$M_S(fg,e) = M_S(g,e)M_S(f,e)$$

Since $fg = gf$, we get $M_S(f,e)M_S(g,e) = M_S(g,e)M_S(f,e)$. The result 2) and an easy induction show that $M_S(f^m,e) = [M_S(f,e)]^m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ □

According to Remark [4.9] and Proposition [4.10], we get that

$$M_S(f^k,e)M_S(f^{q-k},e) = M_S(f^{q-k},e)M_S(f^k,e) = M_S(f^q,e) = fI_{q^n}$$

for all $k \in \{0,1,...,q-1\}$. This shows the following result.

Proposition 4.11 *For every $f \in S$ and $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$, the pair $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{q-k}, e))$ is a matrix factorization of f.*

Discussion 4.12 *Let x_{n+1} be a new variable and let $A = S[x_{n+1}]$ if $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ or ($A = S[[x_{n+1}]]$ if $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$). We aim to describe $M_A(g, e)$ for some $g \in A$ by describing the columns of $M_A(g, e)$. First we will construct a basis of the free A-module $F^e_*(A)$ using the basis $\{F^e_*(j) | j \in \Delta_e\}$ of the free S-module $F^e_*(S)$. For each $v \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$, let*

$$L_v = \{F^e_*(jx^v_{n+1}) \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$$

and set

$$L = L_0 \cup L_1 \cup L_2 \cup ... \cup L_{q-1}$$

Therefore L is a basis for $F^e_*(A)$ as free A-module and if $g \in A$, there exits uniquely a set

$\{g^{(s)}_i \,|\, s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ *and* $i \in \Delta_e\}$

such that

$$F^e_*(g) \;=\; \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} g^{(0)}_i F^e(i) + \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} g^{(1)}_i F^e(ix^1_{n+1}) + ... + \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} g^{(q-1)}_i F^e(ix^{q-1}_{n+1})$$

For each $s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ let $[F^e_*(g)]_{L_s}$ denote the column whose entries are the coordinates $\{g^{(s)}_i \,|\, i \in \Delta_e\}$ of $F^e_*(g)$ with respect to L_s. Let $[F^e_*(g)]_L$ be the following column:

$$[F^e_*(g)]_L = \begin{bmatrix} [F^e_*(g)]_{L_0} \\ \vdots \\ [F^e_*(g)]_{L_{q-1}} \end{bmatrix}$$

If $g \in A$, then $M_A(g, e)$ is the $r_e q \times r_e q$ matrix over A whose columns are all the columns $[F^e_*(jx^s_{n+1}g)]_L$ where $s \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$ and $j \in \Delta_e$. This means that

$$M_A(g, e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0 & \ldots & C_{q-1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.1}$$

where C_m is $r_e q \times r_e$ matrix over A whose columns are the columns $[F^e_*(jx^m_{n+1}g)]_L$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$

If we define $C_{(k,m)}$ *to be the* $r_e \times r_e$ *matrix over* A *whose columns are* $[F_*^e(jx_{n+1}^m g)]_{L_k}$ *for all* $j \in \Delta_e$*, then*

$$C_m = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,m)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,m)} \end{bmatrix}$$

and hence the matrix $M_A(g,e)$ *is given by :*

$$M_A(g,e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0 & \dots & C_{q-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,0)} & \dots & C_{(0,q-1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,0)} & \dots & C_{(q-1,q-1)} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.2}$$

Using the above discussion we can prove the following lemma

Lemma 4.13 *Let* $f \in S$ *with* $M = M_S(f,e)$ *and let* $A = S[x_{n+1}]$ *if* $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ *or (* $A = S[[x_{n+1}]]$ *if* $S = K[[x_1, \dots x_n]]$ *). If* $d \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$*, then*

$$M_A(fx_{n+1}^d, e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,0)} & \dots & C_{(0,q-1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,0)} & \dots & C_{(q-1,q-1)} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$C_{(k,m)} = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } (m,k) \in \{(d,0),(d+1,1),\dots,(q-1,q-1-d)\} \\ x_{n+1}M & \text{if } (m,k) \in \{(0,q-d),(1,q-1-d),\dots,(d,q-1)\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $M = M_S(f,e) = [f_{(i,j)}]$. Therefore, for each $j \in \Delta_e$, $F_*^e(jf)$ can be written uniquely as $F_*^e(jf) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e(i)$. If $g = fx_{n+1}^d$, for every $m \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$ and $j \in \Delta_e$, $F_*^e(jx_{n+1}^m g)$ can be written uniquely as

$$F_*^e(jx_{n+1}^m g) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e(ix_{n+1}^{d+m}) \tag{4.4}$$

Therefore,

$$F_*^e(jx_{n+1}^m g) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e(ix_{n+1}^{d+m}) & \text{if } d+m \le q-1 \\ \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} x_{n+1} f_{(i,j)} F^e(ix_{n+1}^{d+m-q}) & \text{if } d+m > q-1 \end{cases}$$

Accordingly , if $m \le q-1-d$, then

$$C_m = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,m)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,m)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$C_{(k,m)} = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } k = d+m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

However, if $m > q-1-d$, it follows that

$$C_m = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,m)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,m)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$C_{(k,m)} = \begin{cases} x_{n+1}M & \text{if } k = d+m-q \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This shows the required result.

□

Proposition 4.14 *let $A = S[x_{n+1}]$ (if $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$)or $A = S[[x_{n+1}]]$ (if $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$) . Suppose that $g \in A$ is given by*

$$g = g_0 + g_1 x_{n+1} + g_2 x_{n+1}^2 + ... + g_d x_{n+1}^d$$

where $d < q$ *and* $g_k \in S$ *for all* $k \in \{0, ..., d\}$. *If* $M_k = M_S(g_k, e)$ *for each* $k \in \{0, ..., d\}$ *then*

$$M_A(g,e) = \begin{bmatrix} M_0 & & & & x_{n+1}M_d & x_{n+1}M_{d-1} & \dots & x_{n+1}M_1 \\ M_1 & M_0 & & & & x_{n+1}M_d & & \vdots \\ & & & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & & & x_{n+1}M_d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & \\ M_d & \vdots & & & & & & \\ & M_d & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & M_d & M_{d-1} & M_{d-2} & \dots & M_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. By Proposition [4.10], we get

$M_A(g,e) = M_A(g_0,e) + M_A(g_1x_{n+1},e) + M_A(g_2x_{n+1}^2,e) + ... + M_A(g_dx_{n+1}^d,e)$

Using Lemma [4.13], it follows that

$$M_A(g_0,e) = \begin{bmatrix} M_0 & & & \\ & M_0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & M_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$M_A(g_1x_{n+1},e) = \begin{bmatrix} & & & x_{n+1}M_1 \\ M_1 & & & \\ & M_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & M_1 & \\ & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

$$M_A(g_2x_{n+1}^2, e) = \begin{bmatrix} & & x_{n+1}M_2 & \\ & & & x_{n+1}M_2 \\ M_2 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & M_2 & \end{bmatrix}$$

and finally we get

$$M_A(g_dx_{n+1}^d, e) = \begin{bmatrix} & & x_{n+1}M_d & & & \\ & & & x_{n+1}M_d & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & x_{n+1}M_d \\ M_d & & & & & \\ & M_d & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & M_d & & \end{bmatrix}$$

Since $M_A(g, e) = M_A(g_0, e) + M_A(g_1x_{n+1}, e) + M_A(g_2x_{n+1}^2, e) + ... + M_A(g_dx_{n+1}^d, e)$ by Proposition [4.10], the result follows. □

Example. Let K be a perfect field of prime characteristic 3 and let $R = K[x]$ or $R = K[[x]]$. Assume $A = R[y]$ (if $R = K[x]$) or $A = R[[y]]$ (if $R = K[[x]]$). Let $f = x^2 + xy$ and we aim to construct $M_A(f, 1)$ using the above proposition. Let $f_0, f_1 \in R$ where $f_0 = x$ and $f_1 = x^2$. Since the set $\{F^1(1), F^1(x), F^1(x^2)\}$ is a basis of $F^1(R)$ as right R-module, we get that
$F_*^1(f_0) = F_*^1(x) = 1F_*^1(x)$
$F_*^1(xf_0) = F_*^1(x^2) = 1F_*^1(x^2)$
$F_*^1(x^2f_0) = F_*^1(x^3) = xF_*^1(1)$
$F_*^1(f_1) = F_*^1(x^2) = F_*^1(x^2)$

$F^1_*(xf_1) = F^1_*(x^3) = xF^1_*(1)$
$F^1_*(x^2f_1) = F^1_*(x^4) = xF^1_*(x)$

Therefore, $M_R(f_0,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $M_R(f_1,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Let $M_0 = M_R(f_0,1)$ and $M_1 = M_R(f_1,1)$. Since $f = f_0 + f_1y \in A$, by Proposition 4.14 it follows that

$$M_A(f,1) = \begin{bmatrix} M_0 & & yM_1 \\ M_1 & M_0 & \\ & M_1 & M_0 \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & yx \\ 0 & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & y & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & x & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x & 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

□

Lemma 4.15 *Let $I \subseteq S$ be an ideal. If $R = S/I$, then $F^e_*(R)$ is a finitely generated S-module by the set $\{F^e_*(j+I) \mid j \in \Delta_e\}$*

Proof. Recall that the scalar multiplication of the S-module $F^e_*(R)$ is given by $aF^e_*(f+I) = F^e_*(a^q f+I)$ for every $a \in S$ and $f \in S$. Since $F^e_*(S)$ is a free S-module, for $f \in S$ there exists uniquely $\{r_j \in S \mid j \in \Delta_e\}$ such that $F^e_*(f) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} r_j F^e_*(j)$ and hence $f = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} r_j^q j$. Therefore

$$F^e_*(f+I) = F^e_*(\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} r_j^q j + I) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} F^e_*(r_j^q j + I) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} r_j F^e_*(j+I)$$

□

Proposition 4.16 *Let $f \in S$ be a nonzero nonunit element. If $R = S/fS$, then:*
1) $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ as S -modules.
2) $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ as R -modules.
3) If $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ and f is a nonzero element of the maximal ideal of S, then $F^e_*(R)$ is MCM R-module.

Proof. 1) Let I be the ideal fS. Since $\{F^e_*(j) | j \in \Delta_e\}$ is a basis of $F^e_*(S)$ as free S-module, by lemma 4.15 the module $F^e_*(R)$ is generated by the set $\{F^e_*(j + I) \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$ as S-module. Recall that $r_e = [K : K^p]^e q^n$. For every $(g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e} \in S^{r_e}$, define $\phi((g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e}) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} g_j F^e_*(j + I)$. Then $\phi : S^{r_e} \longrightarrow F^e_*(R)$ is a surjective homomorphism of S-modules. Recall that $M_S(f,e) = [f_{(i,j)}]$ where $f_{(i,j)}$ is indexed by $i, j \in \Delta_e$ satisfies that $F^e_*(jf) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)$. If $(h_j)_{j\in\Delta_e} \in S^{r_e}$, define the S-module homomorphism $\psi : S^{r_e} \to S^{r_e}$ by

$$\psi((h_j)_{j\in\Delta_e}) = (\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} h_j)_{i\in\Delta_e}$$

We show that $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ as S -modules by proving that $\mathrm{Im}_S(M_S(f,e)) = \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$. Notice that $\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_i F^e_*(i + I) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} g_j F^e_*(j) = F^e_*(fh)$ for some $h \in S$. Recall that $F^e_*(jf)$ and $F^e_*(h)$ can be written uniquely as $F^e_*(jf) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)$ and $F^e_*(h) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_j F^e_*(j)$ where $h_j \in S$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$ and $M_S(f,e) = [f_{(i,j)}]$. This makes $F^e_*(hf) = F^e_*(h)F^e_*(f) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e}(\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} h_j) F^e_*(i)$ and consequently $\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_i F^e_*(i+I) = 0$ if and only if for all $i \in \Delta_e$, $g_i = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} h_j$ for some $\{h_j \in S \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$. Therefore, $\phi((g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e}) = 0$ if and only if $(g_i)_{i\in\Delta_e} = (\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} h_j)_{i\in\Delta_e}$ for some $\{h_j \in S \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$. This proves that $\mathrm{Im}_S(M_S(f,e)) = \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$ and consequently the following sequence is exact over S

$$S^{r_e} \xrightarrow{\psi} S^{r_e} \xrightarrow{\phi} F^e_*(R) \to 0$$

This makes $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ as S -modules.
2) Since $M_S(f,e)$ is a matrix factorization of f (Proposition [4.11]), it follows by Remark [3.4](1) that $f\,\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e)) = 0$. It is clear that $fF^e_*(R) = 0$. This makes $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ and $F^e_*(R)$ modules over R and consequently $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S(M_S(f,e))$ as R -modules
3) Notice that R is Maximal Cohen Maculay R-module [4, Theorem 2.1.3] and consequently so is $F^e_*(R)$.

□

Corollary 4.17 *Let $f \in S$ be a nonzero and non unit element. If $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$ and $R = S/fS$, then :*
1) $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is isomorphic to $Cok_S(M_S(f^k, e))$ as S -modules.
2) $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is isomorphic to $Cok_S(M_S(f^k, e))$ as R -modules.
3) If $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ and f is a nonzero element of the maximal ideal of S, then $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is MCM R-module.
4) $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is isomorphic to $Cok_S(M_S(f^k, e))$ as S/f^kS -modules.
5) If $S = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ and f is a nonzero element of the maximal ideal of S, then $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is MCM S/f^kS-module.

Proof. 1) It is obvious from Proposition 4.16.
2) Since the pair $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{q-k}, e))$ is a matrix factorization of f, it follows that $fCok_S(M_S(f^k, e)) = 0$. It is clear that $fF^e_*(S/f^kS) = 0$. This makes $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ and $Cok_S(M_S(f^k, e))$ R-moduls and consequently $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is isomorphic to $Cok_S(M_S(f^k, e))$ as R -modules.
3) The same argument as in Proposition 4.16 (3).
4)and 5) can be proved by observing that $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{kq-k}, e))$ is a matrix factorization of f^k and applying the same argument as above. □

Proposition 4.18 *Let f be a nonunit element of $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$, and let $R = S/fS$. If $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$, the exists a unique nonnegative integer a_{ek} such that:*
1) $\sharp(F^e_*(S/f^kS), R) = a_{ek}$.
2) The matrix factorization $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{q-k}, e))$ is equivalent to $(\phi_{ek}, \psi_{ek}) \oplus (f, 1)^{\oplus a_{ek}} \oplus (1, f)^{\oplus b_{ek}}$ where (ϕ_{ek}, ψ_{ek}) is a reduced matrix factorization of f and b_{ek} is a nonnegative integer.

Proof. Recall by Proposition 4.11 that $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{q-k}, e))$ is a matrix factorization of f for every $k \in \{1, ..., q\}$. It follows by Proposition 3.5 that the matrix factorization $(M_S(f^k, e), M_S(f^{q-k}, e))$ is equivalent to $(\phi_{ek}, \psi_{ek}) \oplus (f, 1)^{\oplus a_{ek}} \oplus (1, f)^{\oplus b_{ek}}$ for some reduced matrix factorization (ϕ_{ek}, ψ_{ek}) of f and nonnegative integers a_{ek} and b_{ek}. Now it follows by Corollary 3.10 and Corollary 4.17 that $\sharp(F^e_*(S/f^kS), R) = a_{ek}$. □

Proposition 4.19 *Let $f_1, ..., f_t$ be nonzero and non unite elements in S and let $R = S/(f_1, ..., f_t)S$. Set $r_e = [K : K^p]^e q^n$. If $[M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)]$ is the $r_e \times tr_e$*

matrix over S whose columns are the columns of the matrices $M_S(f_1, e), ..., M_S(f_t, e)$ respectively, then :
1) $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)]$ as S -modules.
2) $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)]$ as R -modules.

Proof. Let I be the ideal $(f_1, ..., f_t)S$. Since $\{F^e_*(j)|j \in \Delta_e\}$ is a basis of $F^e_*(S)$ as free S-module, $F^e_*(R)$ is generated by $\{F^e_*(j + I) \,|\, j \in \Delta_e\}$ as S-module 4.15. For every $(g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e} \in S^{r_e}$, define $\phi((g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e}) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} g_j F^e_*(j + I)$. Then $\phi : S^{r_e} \longrightarrow F^e_*(R)$ is a surjective homomorphism of S-modules. For every $k \in \{1, ..., t\}$ recall that $M_S(f_k, e) = [f^{(k)}_{(i,j)}]$ where $f^{(k)}_{(i,j)}$ is indexed by $i, j \in \Delta_e$ satisfies that $F^e_*(jf) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f^{(k)}_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)$. Now, define S^{tr_e} to be

$$S^{tr_e} = \{((h_{1j})_{j\in\Delta_e}, (h_{2j})_{j\in\Delta_e}, \ldots, (h_{tj})_{j\in\Delta_e}) \,|\, h_{kj} \in S \text{ for all } k \in \{1, ..., t\} \text{ and } j \in \Delta_e\}$$

If $((h_{1j})_{j\in\Delta_e}, \ldots, (h_{tj})_{j\in\Delta_e}) \in S^{tr_e}$, define the S-module homomorphism $\psi : S^{tr_e} \to S^{r_e}$ by

$$\psi((h_{1j})_{j\in\Delta_e}, \ldots, (h_{tj})_{j\in\Delta_e}) = (\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f^{(1)}_{(i,j)} h_{1j} + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} f^{(t)}_{(i,j)} h_{tj})_{i\in\Delta_e}$$

We will show that $F^e_*(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)]$ as S -modules by proving that $\mathrm{Im}_S[M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)] = \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$. Notice that $\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_i F^e_*(i + I) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} g_j F^e_*(j) = F^e_*(f_1h_1) + \ldots + F^e_*(f_th_t)$ for some $\{h_1, \ldots, h_t\} \subseteq S$. For every $k \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ recall that $F^e_*(jf_k)$ and $F^e_*(h_k)$ can be written uniquely as $F^e_*(jf_k) = \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f^{(k)}_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)$ and $F^e_*(h_k) = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{kj} F^e_*(j)$ where $h_{kj} \in S$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$ and $M_S(f_k, e) = [f^{(k)}_{(i,j)}]$. This makes

$$\begin{aligned}
F^e_*(f_1h_1) + \ldots + F^e_*(f_th_t) &= F^e_*(f_1) \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} F^e_*(j) + \ldots F^e_*(f_t) \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} F^e_*(j) \\
&= \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} F^e_*(jf_1) + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} F^e_*(jf_t) \\
&= \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} [\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f^{(1)}_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)] + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} [\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} f^{(t)}_{(i,j)} F^e_*(i)] \\
&= \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} [\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} f^{(1)}_{(i,j)}] F^e_*(i) + \ldots + \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} [\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} f^{(t)}_{(i,j)}] F^e_*(i) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} [\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} f^{(1)}_{(i,j)} + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} f^{(t)}_{(i,j)}] F^e_*(i)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sum_{i\in\Delta_e} g_i F_*^e(i+I) = 0$ if and only if for all $i \in \Delta_e$,

$$g_i = \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} f_{(i,j)}^{(1)} + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} f_{(i,j)}^{(t)}$$

for some $\{h_{kj} \in S \mid k \in \{1,\ldots,t\} \text{ and } j \in \Delta_e\}$. As a result, $\phi((g_j)_{j\in\Delta_e}) = 0$ if and only if

$$(g_i)_{i\in\Delta_e} = (\sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{1j} f_{(i,j)}^{(1)} + \ldots + \sum_{j\in\Delta_e} h_{tj} f_{(i,j)}^{(t)})_{i\in\Delta_e}$$

for some $\{h_{kj} \in S \mid k \in \{1,\ldots,t\} \text{ and } j \in \Delta_e\}$. This proves that $\mathrm{Im}_S(M_S(f,e)) = \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$ and consequently the following sequence is exact over S

$$S^{tr_e} \xrightarrow{\psi} S^{r_e} \xrightarrow{\phi} F_*^e(R) \to 0$$

This proves that $F_*^e(R)$ is isomorphic $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1,e)...M_S(f_t,e)]$ as S -modules.
2) Since $IF_*^e(R) = 0$ and $F_*^e(R)$ is isomorphic $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1,e)...M_S(f_t,e)]$ as S -modules, it follows that $I\,\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1,e)...M_S(f_t,e)] = 0$.
Therefore, $F_*^e(R)$ and $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1,e)...M_S(f_t,e)]$ are both modules over R and $F_*^e(R)$ is isomorphic $\mathrm{Cok}_S[M_S(f_1,e)...M_S(f_t,e)]$ as R -modules.

□

4.3 The ring $S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$ has finite F-representation type

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.

Proposition 4.20 *If $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$, then $S[[y]]/(y^{p^d}+f)$ has FFRT for any $f \in S$.*

Proof. Let $\Re := S[[y]]/(y^{p^d}+f)$ and let A be the matrix $M_S(f,e)$ in $M_{r_e}(S)$ where $e > d$ and let I be the identity matrix in $M_{r_e}(S)$. Set M and N to be the $p^d \times p^d$ matrices over the ring $M_{r_e}(S)$ as follows:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & & \\ & A & & & \\ & & A & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & A \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } N = \begin{bmatrix} I & & & & \\ & I & & & \\ & & I & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & I \end{bmatrix}$$

Therefore, by Proposition [4.14] the matrix $M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^d}+f, e)$ can be written as a $p^{e-d} \times p^{e-d}$ matrix over the ring $M_{p^d}(M_{r_e}(S[[y]]))$ in the following way:

$$M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^d}+f, e) = \begin{bmatrix} M & & & & yN \\ N & M & & & \\ & N & M & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & N & M \end{bmatrix}$$

By Lemma [2.24], the matrix $M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^d}+f,e)$ is equivalent to the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & yN+(-1)^{1+p^{e-d}}M^{p^{e-d}} \end{bmatrix}$$

As a result, it follows by Proposition [4.16] that

$$F^e_*(\Re) = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^d}+f,e)) = (\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(yI+A^{p^{e-d}}))^{\oplus p^d} \tag{4.5}$$

We know by Proposition [4.10] that $A^{p^{e-d}} = M_S(f^{p^{e-d}},e)$. If I is the $r_e \times r_e$ identity matrix, by Proposition [4.14] and Remark [4.9], it follows that $M_{S[[y]]}(f^{p^{e-d}},e)$ and $M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^e},e)$ are $p^e \times p^e$ matrices over the ring $M_{r_e}(S[[y]])$ that are given by

$$M_{S[[y]]}(f^{p^{e-d}},e) = \begin{bmatrix} A^{p^{e-d}} & & & & & \\ & A^{p^{e-d}} & & & & \\ & & A^{p^{e-d}} & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & A^{p^{e-d}} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and}$$

$$M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^e},e) = \begin{bmatrix} yI & & & & \\ & yI & & & \\ & & yI & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & yI \end{bmatrix}$$

By Proposition [4.10] It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^e}+f^{p^{e-d}},e) &= M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^e},e)+M_{S[[y]]}(f^{p^{e-d}},e) \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} yI+A^{p^{e-d}} & & & & \\ & yI+A^{p^{e-d}} & & & \\ & & yI+A^{p^{e-d}} & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & yI+A^{p^{e-d}} \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore by Proposition [4.16]

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^e_*(S[[y]]/(y^{p^e}+f^{p^{e-d}})) &= \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(M_{S[[y]]}(y^{p^e}+f^{p^{e-d}},e)) \\
&= [\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(yI+A^{p^{e-d}})]^{\oplus p^e} \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

However, we notice that

$$F^e_*(S[[y]]/(y^{p^e}+f^{p^{e-d}})) = F^d_*[F^{e-d}_*(S[[y]]/(y^{p^d}+f)^{p^{e-d}}))]$$

Recall that $\Re = S[[y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$. If $I_{p^{e-d}}$ is the identity matrix in $M_{p^{e-d}}(S[[y]])$, then we get by Proposition [4.16] and Remark [4.9] that

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{e-d}_*(S[[y]]/(y^{p^d}+f)^{p^{e-d}}) &= \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(M_{S[[y]]}((y^{p^d}+f)^{p^{e-d}},e-d) \\
&= \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}((y^{p^d}+f)I_{p^{e-d}}) \\
&= [\Re]^{\oplus p^{(e-d)(n+1)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying the functor $F^d_*(-)$ on the both sides of the above equation gives that

$$F^e_*(S[[y]]/(Y^{p^e}+f^{p^{e-d}})) = [F^d_*(\Re)]^{\oplus p^{(e-d)(n+1)}}$$

As a result, by equation [4.6] $[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(yI+A^{p^{e-d}})]^{\oplus p^e}$ is isomorphic to $[F^d_*(\Re)]^{\oplus p^{(e-d)(n+1)}}$ as $S[[y]]$-modules. Since $F^d_*(\Re)$ is finitely generated $S[[y]]$-module, it follows that $F^d_*(\Re)$ is a direct sum with direct summands taken from a finite set of indecomposable finitely generated $S[[y]]$-modules, say $M_1, ..., M_s$. By Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem, the $S[[y]]$-module $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[y]]}(yI+A^{p^{e-d}})$ is also a direct sum with direct

summands taken from $M_1, ..., M_s$. Therefore, by equation [5.10] $F^e_*(\Re)$ is a direct sum with direct summands taken from $M_1, ..., M_s$ as $S[[y]]$-module. Since $(y^{p^d} + f)F^d_*(\Re) = 0$, we get that $M_1, ..., M_s$ are all finitely generated $\Re$-modules. This shows that $\Re$ has FFRT.

□

4.4 When does the ring $S[[u, v]]/(f+uv)$ have finite F-representation type?

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.
The purpose of this section is to provide a characterization of when the ring $S[[u, v]]/(f+uv)$ has finite F-representation type. This characterization enables us of creating a class of rings in the last section that have FFRT but not finite CM type. We need first to establish a notation and a lemma that play a role in proving the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.21 *Let u and v be new variables on S and let $F = S[u, v]$ if $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ (or $F = S[[u, v]]$ if $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$). Let $R^\bigstar = F/(f + uv)$. If A is the matrix $M_S(f, e)$ for some $f \in S$ and I is the identity matrix in the ring $M_{r_e}(S)$, then*

$$F^e_*(F/(f + uv)) = \mathrm{Cok}_F(M_F(f + uv, e)) = (R^\bigstar)^{r_e} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_F\, B_j$$

where $B_k = \begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}$ *for all* $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$.

Proof. First, we will construct an ordered basis L of $F^e_*(F)$ that makes the matrix $M_F(f + uv, e)$ a block diagonal matrix. For this purpose, we need to fix some notations that we need later. Let

$$\lambda_0 = \{(r, r)|r \in \{0, ..., q-1\}\}$$

and for each $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$ define

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k &:= \{(k,0),(k+1,1),...,(q-1,q-k-1),(0,q-k),(1,q-k+1),...,(k-1,q-1)\} \\ &= \{(k+r,r)|r \in \{0,...,q-k-1\} \cup \{(i,q-k+i)|i \in \{0,...,k-1\}\}\end{aligned}$$

For each $(s,t) \in \lambda_k$, let $L_{(s,t)} := \{F_*^e(iu^s v^t) \,|\, i \in \Delta_e\}$ and let

$$L_0 := L_{(0,0)} \cup L_{(1,1)} \cup ... \cup L_{(q-1,q-1)}$$

For each $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$ define

$$L_k := L_{(k,0)} \cup L_{(k+1,1)} \cup ... \cup L_{(q-1,q-k-1)} \cup L_{(0,q-k)} \cup ... \cup L_{(k-1,q-1)}$$

Now set

$$L := L_0 \cup L_1 \cup ... \cup L_{q-1}$$

to be the ordered basis of the free F-module $F_*^e(F)$.

As a result, if $h \in F$, there exists uniquely a set

$$\{h_{(i,l,m)} \in F \,|\, i \in \Delta_e \text{ and } l, m \in \{0, ..., q-1\}\}$$

such that

$$F_*^e(h) = \sum_{(l,m)\in\lambda_0} \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} h_{(i,l,m)} F_*^e(iu^l v^m) + \sum_{(l,m)\in\lambda_1} \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} h_{(i,l,m)} F_*^e(iu^l v^m) + \ldots$$
$$\ldots + \sum_{(l,m)\in\lambda_{q-1}} \sum_{i\in\Delta_e} h_{(i,l,m)} F_*^e(iu^l v^m)$$

For each $i \in \Delta_e$ and $l, m \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ let $[F_*^e(h)]_{(i,l,m)}$ denote $h_{(i,l,m)}$ and let $[F_*^e(h)]_{L_{(l,m)}}$ denote the column whose entries are all $[F_*^e(h)]_{(i,l,m)}$ for all $i \in \Delta_e$. Now define $[F_*^e(h)]_{L_k}$ to be the column of all $[F_*^e(h)]_{L_{(l,m)}}$ with $(l,m) \in \lambda_k$. After that define $[F_*^e(h)]$ to be the column

$$[F_*^e(h)] = \begin{bmatrix} [F_*^e(h)]_{L_0} \\ \vdots \\ [F_*^e(h)]_{L_{q-1}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Using this notation, if $g \in F$, the matrix $M_F(g,e)$ consists of all columns $[F_*^e(ju^sv^tg)]$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$ and all $s,t \in \{0,...,q-1\}$. This makes

$$M_F(g,e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0 & \dots & C_{q-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

where C_k for each $k \in \Delta_e$ represents all columns $[F_*^e(ju^sv^tg)]$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$ and all $(s,t) \in \lambda_k$.

In other words, $C_k = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,k)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{(q-1,k)} \end{bmatrix}$ where $C_{(r,k)}$ denotes all columns $[F_*^e(ju^sv^tg)]_{L_k}$ with $j \in \Delta_e$ and $(s,t) \in \lambda_r$.

Now, we aim to show that the matrix $M_F(f+uv,e)$ has the form

$$M_F(f+uv,e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,0)} & & & \\ & C_{(1,1)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & C_{(q-1,q-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Recall that if $M_s(f,e) = [f_{(i,j)}]$, then $F_*^e(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{q^n} f_{(i,j)} F_*^e(i)$ for all $j \in \Delta_e$. As a result, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^e(ju^sv^t(f+uv)) &= F_*^e(jf)F_*^e(u^sv^t) + F_*^e(ju^{s+1}v^{t+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F_*^e(iu^sv^t) + F_*^e(ju^{s+1}v^{t+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Notice that if $(s,s) \in \lambda_0 - \{(q-1,q-1)\}$, we get by equation 4.7 that

$$F_*^e(ju^sv^s(f+uv)) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F_*^e(iu^sv^s) + F^e(ju^{s+1}v^{s+1}) \tag{4.8}$$

However, if $(s,s) = (q-1,q-1)$, we get by equation 4.7 that

$$F_*^e(ju^{q-1}v^{q-1}(f+uv)) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F_*^e(iu^{q-1}v^{q-1}) + uvF_*^e(j) \tag{4.9}$$

The equations 4.8 and 4.9 show that for each $s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ we get $[F^e(\alpha_j u^s v^s(f + uv))]_{L_r} = 0$ for all $r \neq 0$ and consequently $C_{(k,0)} = 0$ whenever $k \neq 0$ Now, suppose that $(s,t) \in \lambda_k$ where $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$.
If $(s,t) \in \lambda_k - \{(q-1, q-k-1), (k-1, q-1)\}$, by equation 4.7 we get

$$F^e_*(ju^s v^t(f + uv)) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e_*(iu^s v^t) + F^e_*(ju^{s+1} v^{t+1}) \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, if $(s,t) = (q-1, q-k-1)$, by equation 4.7, we get

$$F^e_*(ju^s v^t(f + uv)) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e_*(iu^s v^t) + uF^e_*(jv^{q-k}) \tag{4.11}$$

Finally, if $(s,t) = (k-1, q-1)$, by equation 4.7, we get

$$F^e_*(ju^s v^t(f + uv)) = \sum_{i \in \Delta_e} f_{(i,j)} F^e_*(iu^s v^t) + vF^e_*(ju^{s+1}) \tag{4.12}$$

As a result, for each $(s,t) \in \lambda_k$ where $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$ the equations 4.9 ,4.10 and 4.11 show that $[F^e(ju^s v^t(f + uv))]_{L_r} = 0$ whenever $r \neq k$.

As a result, since $L = L_0 \cup L_1 \cup ... \cup L_{q-1}$ is a basis of $F^e(R)$ as free R-module, it follows by the above results and equations that

$$M_R(f + uv, e) = \begin{bmatrix} C_{(0,0)} & & & \\ & C_{(1,1)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & C_{(q-1,q-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where each $C_{(k,k)}$ is $q \times q$ matrix over the ring $M_{r_e}(R)$ (or equivalently $C_{(k,k)}$ is $r_e q \times r_e q$ matrix over R) that is given by $C_{(0,0)} = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & uvI \\ I & A & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & I & A \end{bmatrix}$,

$$C_{(1,1)} = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & vI \\ I & A & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & uI & A \end{bmatrix} ,..., C_{(q-2,q-2)} = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & & vI \\ I & A & & & \\ & uI & A & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & I & A \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C_{(q-1,q-1)} = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & vI \\ uI & A & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & I & A \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } I \text{ is the identity matrix over the ring } M_{r_e}(R) .$$

From Corollary 2.25 , C_0 is equivalent to the matrix $B^{(0)} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc} I & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & I & & \\ \hline & & & (-1)^q A^{q-1} & uvI \\ & & & I & A \end{array}\right]$

and C_k is equivalent to the matrix $B^{(k)} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc} I & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & I & & \\ \hline & & & A^{q-k} & -vI \\ & & & uI & A^k \end{array}\right]$ for all $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$. By Proposition 4.16 it follows that

$$F^e_*(F/(f+uv)) = \mathrm{Cok}_F(M_F(f+uv, e)) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_F\, C_{(k,k)} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_F\, B^{(k)} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_F\, B_k$$

where $B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} (-1)^q A^{q-1} & uvI \\ I & A \end{bmatrix}$ and $B_k = \begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}$ for all $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$.
Using the fact that (A, A^{q-1}) is a matrix factorization of f and appropriate row and column operations on B_0, we get that B_0 is equivalent to the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} (f+uv)I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and consequently

$$\mathrm{Cok}_F(B_0) = (R^\bigstar)^{r_e}$$

This proves the desired result

□

We need the following corollary later

Corollary 4.22 *Let $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S. Let $R = S/fS$ where $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$. Let $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. If $A = M_S(f, e)$, then*

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\bigstar), R^\bigstar) = r_e + 2\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R)$$

Proof.

By Proposition 4.21, it follows that

$$F^e_*(R^\bigstar) = (R^\bigstar)^{r_e} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]} \begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}$$

However, For each $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$, we notice that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]} \begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\maltese}$$

Therefore, by Corollary 3.10 and the convention that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k}) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sharp(F^e_*(R^\bigstar), R^\bigstar) &= r_e + \sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\maltese}, R^\bigstar) \\
&= r_e + \sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \left[\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k}), R) + \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{q-k}, A^k), R)\right] \\
&= r_e + 2\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k}), R) \\
&= r_e + 2\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k), R)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.23 *Let $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S. Let $R = S/fS$ where $f \in \mathfrak{m} - \{0\}$ and let $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. If K is a perfect field and $A = M_S(f, e)$, then*

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\bigstar), R^\bigstar) = q^n + 2\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R)$$

Proof. Recall that $r_e = [K : K^p]^e q^n$. Since K is a perfect field, it follows that $[K : K^p] = 1$. □

Proposition 4.24 *Let K be an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ and $q = p^e$. Let $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - 0$. Let $R = S/(f)$ and $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. Then $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ has FFRT over $R^\bigstar$ if and only if $\{F^e_*(S/(f^k)) \,|0 \leq k < p^e$ and $e \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are direct sums with direct summands taken from a finite set of indecomposable R-modules*

Proof. First, suppose that $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f+uv)$ has FFRT over $R^\bigstar$ by $M_1, ..., M_t$ and $R^\bigstar$ where M_j is an indecomposable non free $R^\bigstar$-module for each $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. Since $F^e_*(R^\bigstar)$ is MCM $R^\bigstar$-module (by Proposition 4.16), each M_j is a non-free indecomposable MCM $R^\bigstar$-module for every $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. As a result, by Proposition 3.8 and 3.9 $M_j = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_j, \beta_j)^{\maltese}$ where (α_j, β_j) is a reduced matrix factorization of f such that $\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ is non-free indecomposable MCM R-module for all

$j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. Since K is algebraically closed field, we get by Proposition 4.21 that

$$F_*^e(S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)) \cong (R^\bigstar)^{q^n} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}) \tag{4.13}$$

where $A = M_S(f,e)$ and $A^k = (M_S(f,e))^k = M_S(f^k,e)$ (by Proposition 4.10). Recall that $\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}) = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(A^k, A^{q-k})^\maltese$ for each k. Since (A^k, A^{q-k}) is a matrix factorization of f, there exist , by Proposition 3.5, a reduced matrix factorization (ϕ_k, ψ_k) of f and non-negative integers t_k and r_k such that $(A^k, A^{q-k}) \sim (\phi_k, \psi_k) \oplus (f,1)^{t_k} \oplus (1,f)^{r_k}$. This gives (by Remark 3.4) that

$$Cok_{S[[u,v]]}(A^k, A^{q-k})^\maltese = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_k, \psi_k)^\maltese \oplus [R^\maltese]^{t_k+r_k}$$

Since $R^\bigstar$ has FFRT over $R^\bigstar$ and $R^\bigstar$ is a complete local ring ,by the equality 4.13 and the Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem (KRS)[6, Corollary 1.10], there exist non negative integers $n_{(e,k,1)}, ..., n_{(e,k,t)}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_k, \psi_k)^\maltese \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} M_j^{n_{(e,k,j)}} \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} [\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_j, \beta_j)^\maltese]^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}} \tag{4.14}$$

With the convention that $(\alpha,\beta)^{\oplus n} = (\alpha,\beta) \oplus ... \oplus (\alpha,\beta)$ when (α,β) appears n times and by Remark 3.4 we obtain

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\phi_k, \psi_k)^\maltese \cong \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} (\alpha_j, \beta_j)^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}}]^\maltese \tag{4.15}$$

Notice that the two matrix factorizations (ϕ_k, ψ_k) and $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} (\alpha_j, \beta_j)^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}}$ are both reduced. By Preposition 3.12 , Corollary 4.17, and the above equality, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_S(\phi_k, \psi_k) \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} N_j^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}}$$

where $N_j = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. As a result, it follows that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k}) = \mathrm{Cok}_S[(\phi_k, \psi_k) \oplus (f,1)^{r_k} \oplus (1,f)^{t_k}] = R^{r_k} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} N_j^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}} \tag{4.16}$$

for all $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$. Since $F^e_*(S/f^kS) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k})$ by Corollary 4.17, we conclude that

$$F^e_*(S/f^kS) = R^{r_k} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} N_j^{\oplus n_{(e,k,j)}}$$

for all $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$. This shows that $\{F^e_*(S/(f^k))\,|0 \leq k < p^e \text{ and } e \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are direct sums with direct summands taken from a finite set of indecomposable R-modules.
Now , suppose that $\{F^e_*(S/(f^k))\,|0 \leq k < p^e \text{ and } e \in \mathbb{N}\}$are direct sums with direct summands taken from a finite set of indecomposable R-modules $\{N_1, ..., N_t\} \bigcup R$. Therefore, for each $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$, there exist non negative integers $n_{(e,k)}, n_{(e,k,1)}, ..., n_{(e,k,t)}$ such that

$$F^e_*(S/f^kS) \cong R^{n_{(e,k)}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} N_j^{n_{(e,k,j)}} \text{ over } R \tag{4.17}$$

Since $F^e_*(S/f^kS)$ is a MCM R-module (by Corollary 4.17), it follows that N_j is an indecomposable non free MCM R-module for each $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. This means that N_j is stable MCM R-module for each $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$ and consequently by Proposition 3.9 $N_j = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for some reduced matrix factorization (α_j, β_j) for all $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. Let $M_j = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(\alpha_j, \beta_j)^{\maltese}$. Recall that $F^e_*(S/f^kS) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k})$ where $A = M_S(f, s)$ and (A^k, A^{q-k}) is a matrix factorization of f for all $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$. By Proposition 3.12 and Remark 3.4, we get that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}\left(\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\maltese} = (R^{\bigstar})^{n_{(e,k)}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} M_j^{n_{(e,k,j)}}$$

Since

$$F^e_*(S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)) \cong (R^{\bigstar})^{q^n} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}\left(\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k} \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

we obtain that $R^{\bigstar} = S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$ has FFRT by $M_1, ..., M_t$ and $R^{\bigstar}$ □

Corollary 4.25 *Let K be an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ and $q = p^e$. Let $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - 0$. Let $R = S/(f)$ and $R^{\bigstar} = S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$. If $R^{\bigstar} = S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$ has FFRT over $R^{\bigstar}$, then S/f^kS has FFRT over S/f^kS for every positive integer k.*

Proof. Let e_0 be a positive integer such that $p^{e_0} > k$. By the above proposition, there exist finitely generated R-modules $N_1, ..., N_t$ such that $F^e_*(S/(f^k))$ for each $e \geq e_0$ is a direct sums with direct summands taken from the finite set $\{R, N_1, ..., N_t\}$. Notice from the proof of the above proposition that $N_j = \mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ for some reduced matrix factorization (α_j, β_j) for all $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$. As a result, $f \,\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j) = 0$ and hence $f^k \,\mathrm{Cok}_S(\alpha_j, \beta_j) = 0$ for every positive integer k. This makes N_j a S/f^kS-module for each k. Therefore,$F^e_*(S/(f^k))$ for each $e \geq e_0$ is a direct sums with direct summands taken from the finite set $\{R, N_1, ..., N_t\}$ of the S/f^kS-modules. This is enough to show that S/f^kS has FFRT over S/f^kS for every positive integer k. □

The above corollary implies evidently the following.

Corollary 4.26 *Let K be an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ and $q = p^e$. Let $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - 0$. Let $R = S/(f)$ and $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. If S/f^kS does not have FFRT over S/f^kS for some positive integer k, then $R^\bigstar$ does not have FFRT. In particular, if R does not have FFRT , then $R^\bigstar$ does not have FFRT*

An easy induction gives the following result.

Corollary 4.27 *Let K be an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ and $q = p^e$. Let $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of S, $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - 0$and let $R = S/(f)$. If R does not have FFRT, then the ring*

$$S[[u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, ..., u_t, v_t]]/(f + u_1v_1 + u_2v_2 + ... + u_tv_t)$$

does not have FFRT for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.5 Class of rings that have FFRT but not finite CM type

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.

Recall that, a local ring (R, m) is said to have finite CM type if there are only finitely many isomorphism classes of indecomposable MCM R-modules. By the definition of the FFRT (Definition [4.1]), it is clear that every F-finite local ring (R, m) of prime characteristic that has finite CM type has also FFRT. The main result of this section is to provide a class of rings that have FFRT but not finite CM type [Proposition 4.38].

Lemma 4.28 *If $d, k \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$, then*
i) $dk = nq + s$ where $n \in \{0, ..., d-1\}$ and $s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$
ii) For any $\beta \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$, $dk+\beta = cq+t$ where $m \in \{0, ..., d\}$ and $t \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$

Proof. i) By Division Algorithm, $dk = nq+s$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$. If $n \geq d$, we get $nq \geq dq > dk = nq + s \geq nq$ which is a contradiction. This shows that $n \in \{0, ..., d-1\}$.
ii) From the above result, we get that $dk = nq + s$ where $n \in \{0, ..., d-1\}$ and $s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$. Let $\beta \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$. If $\beta + s < q$, we get $dk + \beta = mq + t$ where $m = n \in \{0, ..., d-1\}$ and $t = \beta + s \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$. Now, suppose that $\beta + s \geq q$. We notice that $0 \leq \beta + s - q \leq q - 1$. Therefore $dk + \beta = mq + t$ where $m = n + 1 \in \{1, ..., d\}$ and $t = \beta + s - q \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ □

If $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, we write $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1}...x^{\alpha_n}$ where $x_1, ..., x_n$ are different variables.

Lemma 4.29 *Let $f = x_1^{d_1}x_2^{d_2}...x_n^{d_n}$ be a monomial in S where $d_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for each j. Let $\Gamma = \{(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \,|\, 0 \leq \alpha_j \leq d_j \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$, $d = (d_1, ..., d_n)$, and let e be a positive integer such that $q = p^e > max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} + 1$. If $A = M_S(f, e)$, then for each $k \in \{1, ..., q-1\}$ the matrix $A^k = M_S(f^k, e)$ is equivalent to diagonal matrix, D, of size $r_e \times r_e$ in which the diagonal entries are of the form x^c where $c \in \Gamma$. Furthermore, if $c = (c_1, ..., c_n) \in \Gamma$ and*

$$\eta_k(c_j) = \begin{cases} q - |c_jq - kd_j| \text{ if } |c_jq - kd_j| < q \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

then

$$\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^q, A^{q-k}) = \bigoplus_{c\in\Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_S(x^c, x^{d-c})\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)}$$

where $\eta_k(c) = [K : K^q]\prod_{j=1}^n \eta_k(c_j)$ *with the convention that* $M^{\oplus 0} = \{0\}$ *for any module* M *and* (x^c, x^{d-c}) *is the* 1×1 *matrix factorization of* f.

Proof. Choose $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $q = p^e > max\{d_1, ..., d_n\}+1$ and let $k \in \{1, .., q-1\}$. If $j = \lambda x_1^{\beta_1}...x_n^{\beta_n} \in \Delta_e$, we get $F_*^e(jf^k) = F_*^e(x_1^{kd_1+\beta_1}...x_n^{kd_n+\beta_n})$. By lemma 4.28, there exist $c_i \in \{0, ..., d\}$ and $u_i \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $d_ik + \beta_i = c_iq + u_i$. As a result, it follows that

$$F_*^e(jf^k) = x_1^{c_1}...x_n^{c_n}F_*^e(\lambda x_1^{u_1}...x_n^{u_n})$$

This yields that each column and each row of $M_S(f^k, e)$ contains only one none zero element of the form $x_1^{c_1}...x_n^{c_n}$ where $m_i \in \{0, ..., d\}$ for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Accordingly, using the row and column operations, the matrix $M_S(f^k, e)$ is equivalent to diagonal matrix, D, of size $r_e \times r_e$ in which the diagonal entries are of the form $x_1^{c_1}...x_n^{c_n}$ where $c_i \in \{0, ..., d\}$ for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$

Now fix $c = (c_1, ..., c_n) \in \Gamma$ and let $\eta(c)$ stand for how many times x^c appears as an element in the diagonal of D. It is obvious that $\eta(c)$ is exactly the same as the number of the n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ associated with all $\lambda \in \Lambda_e$ satisfying that

$$F_*^e(\lambda x_1^{kd_1+\alpha_1}...x_n^{kd_n+\alpha_n}) = x_1^{c_1}...x_n^{c_n}F_*^e(\lambda x_1^{s_1}...x_n^{s_n}) \text{ for some } s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\} \quad (4.18)$$

However, an n-tuple $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ will satisfy the equation 4.18 if and only if $\alpha_j = c_jq - kd_j + s_j$ for some $s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ whenever $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. As a result, the n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ will satisfy the equation 4.18 if and only if

$$|c_jq - kd_j| < q \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\}$$

Indeed, for $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, set $u_j = c_jq - kd_j$. If $0 \le u_j < q$, we can choose $\alpha_j \in \{u_j, u_j+1, ..., q-1\}$. On the other hand, if such that $-q < u_j < 0$, then α_j can be taken from $\{q-1+u_j, q-2+u_j, ..., -u_j+u_j\}$. Therefore, if $0 \le |c_jq - kd_j| < q$, then α_j can be chosen by $q - |c_jq - kd_j|$ ways. Set

$$\eta_k(c_j) = \begin{cases} q - |c_jq - kd_j| \text{ if } |c_jq - kd_j| < q \\ \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thus we get that $\eta_k(c) = [K : K^q] \prod_{j=1}^n \eta_k(c_j)$. Now if $\tilde{\Gamma} = \{c \in \Gamma \mid \eta_k(c) > 0\}$, it follows that

$$\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^q, A^{q-k}) = \bigoplus_{c \in \tilde{\Gamma}} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_S(x^c, x^{d-c})\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)} = \bigoplus_{c \in \Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_S(x^c, x^{d-c})\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)}$$

□

Corollary 4.30 *Let K be an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ and $q = p^e$. Let $S := K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ and $f = x_1^{d_1} x_2^{d_2} ... x_n^{d_n}$ where $d_j \in \mathbf{N}$ for each j . Then $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ has FFRT over $R^\bigstar$. Furthermore, for every $e \in \mathbf{N}$ with $q = p^e > max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} + 1$, $F_*^e(R^\bigstar)$ has the following decomposition:*

$$F_*^e(R^\bigstar) = (R^\bigstar)^{q^n} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q-1} \left[\bigoplus_{c \in \Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\maltese}\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)} \right]$$

where $\eta_k(c)$ and Γ as they are in the above lemma.

Proof. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q = p^e > max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} + 1$ and let $k \in \{1, .., q-1\}$. Let Γ and $\eta_k(c)$ be as in the above lemma. If $A = M_S(f, e)$, it follows that

$$F^e(S/f^k) \cong \mathrm{Cok}_S(A^q, A^{q-k}) \cong \bigoplus_{c \in \Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_S(x^c, x^{d-c})\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)}$$

If $L = \{\mathrm{Cok}_S(x^c, x^{d-c}) \mid c \in \Gamma\} \cup \{F^j(S/f^i) \mid p^j \leq \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq p^j\}$, then $\{F^e(S/(f^k))\}_{0 \leq k < p^e}^{e \in \mathbb{N}}$ are direct sums with direct summands taken from the finite set L. By Proposition 3.8 $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$ has FFRT over $R^\bigstar$.

Furthermore, we can describe explicitly the direct summands of $F_*^e(R^\bigstar)$. Indeed, if $\hat{\Gamma} := \{c \in \Gamma \mid \eta_k(c) > 0 \text{ and } c \notin \{d, 0\}\}$, it follows that

$$(A^k, A^{q-k}) \sim \bigoplus_{c \in \hat{\Gamma}} (x^c, x^{d-c})^{\oplus \eta_k(c)} \bigoplus (x^d, 1)^{\oplus \eta_k(d)} \bigoplus (1, x^d)^{\oplus \eta_k(0)}$$

Recall by Remark 3.4 that $(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\maltese}$ is a matrix factorization of $f + uv$ and

$$(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\maltese} \sim \bigoplus_{c \in \hat{\Gamma}} \left[(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\maltese}\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(c)} \bigoplus \left[(x^d, 1)^{\maltese}\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(d)} \bigoplus \left[(1, x^d)^{\maltese}\right]^{\oplus \eta_k(0)}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k}\end{bmatrix} &= \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(A^k, A^{q-k})^{\Phi} \\ &= \bigoplus_{c\in\hat{\Gamma}} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\Phi}\right]^{\oplus\eta_k(c)} \bigoplus \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^d, 1)^{\Phi}\right]^{\oplus\eta_k(d)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(1, x^d)^{\Phi}\right]^{\oplus\eta_k(0)}\end{aligned}$$

Using the above equation and the convention that $M^{\oplus 0} = \{0\}$, we can write

$$\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k}\end{bmatrix} = \bigoplus_{c\in\Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\Phi}\right]^{\oplus\eta_k(c)}$$

By Proposition 4.21 and the above equation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}F_*^e(S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)) &= (R^{\bigstar})^{q^n} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}\begin{bmatrix} A^k & -vI \\ uI & A^{q-k}\end{bmatrix} \\ &= (R^{\bigstar})^{q^n} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q-1} \left[\bigoplus_{c\in\Gamma} \left[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\Phi}\right]^{\oplus\eta_k(c)}\right]\end{aligned}$$

This proves that the ring $R^{\bigstar} = S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$ has FFRT by finitely generated $R^{\bigstar}$-modules taken from the finite set

$$\{F_*^t(R^{\bigstar}) \mid 0 \le t < e\} \cup \{\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[u,v]]}(x^c, x^{d-c})^{\Phi} \mid c \in \Gamma\}$$

□

From Proposition 3.8, we conclude the following fact.

Corollary 4.31 *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ be a complete regular local ring such that k is algebraically closed of characteristic not 2 and $f \in \mathfrak{m}^2 - \{0\}$. let $R^{\bigstar} := S[[u,v]]/(f+uv)$. Then R has finite CM type if and only if $R^{\bigstar}$ has finite CM type.*

Now we will state definitions and facts from [6] that lead eventually to the main result [Proposition 4.38].

Definition 4.32 *[6, Definition 9.1] Let $(S, \mathfrak{n})$ be a regular local ring, and let $R = S/(g)$, where $0 \neq g \in \mathfrak{n}^2$. We call R a simple singularity (relative to the presentation $R = S/(g)$) provided there are only finitely many ideals L of S such that $g \in L^2$*

Definition 4.33 *[6, Definition A.19 page 433]*
let (R, m, k) be a local ring of dimension d, let I be an m-primary ideal of R, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. The multiplicity of I on M is defined by

$$e_R(I, M) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d!}{n^d} \ell_R(M/I^n M)$$

where $\ell_R(-)$ denotes length as an R-module. In particular we set $e_R(M) = e_R(m, M)$ and call it the multiplicity of M. Finally, we denote $e(R) = e_R(R)$ and call it the multiplicity of the ring R.

Lemma 4.34 *[6, Corollary A.24 page 435]*
Let (S, m) be a regular local ring and $f \in S$ a non-zero nonunit. Then the multiplicity of the hypersurface ring $R = S/(f)$ is the largest integer t such that $f \in n^t$.

Lemma 4.35 *[6, Lemma 9.3]*
Let (S, m, k) be a regular local ring and $R = S/(f)$ a singularity with $d = dim(R) > 1$. If R is a simple singularity, then $e(R) \leq 3$.

Proposition 4.36 *[6, Theorem 9.8]*
Let k be an algebraically closed field with $char(k) \neq 2, 3, 5$, let $d > 1$, and let $R = k[[x, y, x_2, ..., x_d]]/(g)$, where $0 \neq g \in (x, y, x_2, ..., x_d)^2$. These are equivalent:
(i) R has finite CM type.
(ii) R is a simple singularity.

Corollary 4.37 *Let k be an algebraically closed field with $char(k) \neq 0, 2, 3, 5$, and let $S = k[[x_1, ..., x_k]]$ where $k \geq 2$.*
i) If $f \in S$ is a monomial of degree grater than 3 and $R = S/(f)$, then R does not have finite CM type.
ii) If $f \in S$ is a monomial of degree grater than 3 and $R^\bigstar = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$, then $R^\bigstar$ does not have finite CM type.

Proof. Let t be the degree of the monomial f and let m be the maximal ideal $< x_1, ..., x_k > S$. Clearly, t is the largest natural number satisfying $f \in m^t - m^{t+1}$

and consequently $e(R) = t$ (by Fact 4.34). Since $e(R) = t > 3$, R is not a simple singularity(using Lemma 4.35). Therefore, (by Proposition 4.36)R does not have finite CM type. Consequently, by Corollary 4.31, $R^\star$ does not have finite CM type as well.

□

Corollary [4.30] and Corollary [4.37] prove the following main result of this section

Proposition 4.38 *Let k be an algebraically closed field with $char(k) \neq 0, 2, 3, 5$, and let $S = k[[x_1, ..., x_k]]$ where $k \geq 2$. If $f \in S$ is a monomial of degree grater than 3 and $R^\star = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$, then $R^\star$ has FFRT but it does not have finite CM type.*

4.6 S/I has FFRT when I is a monomial ideal

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.

Definition 4.39 *[16, Definition 1.1.1] Let R be a commutative ring with identity. A monomial in the elements $X_1, ..., X_n \in R$ is an element of the form $X_1^{r_1}...X_n^{r_n}$ where $r_1, ..., r_n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $R = A[X_1, ..., X_n]$ (or $R = A[[X_1, ..., X_n]]$) where A is a nonzero commutative ring with identity . A monomial ideal in R is an ideal of R that can be generated by monomials in $X_1, ..., X_n$.*

Proposition 4.19 enables us to prove the following result

Proposition 4.40 *Let S denote the ring $K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ or the ring $K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ where K is a field of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$. Let I be a monomial ideal in S generated by the monomials $f_1, ..., f_t$. If $R = S/I$, then R has Finite F-representation type on R.*

Proof. For every $j \in \{1, ..., t\}$, according to the proof of [Lemma 4.29], each column and each row of $M_S(f_j, e)$ contains only one none zero element of the form $x_1^{m_1}...x_n^{m_n}$ where $m_r \in \{0, ..., d\}$ for all $r \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Therefore, if $A = [M_S(f_1, e)...M_S(f_t, e)]$, then each row of A contains only t none zero elements and each column contains only one none zero element of the form $x_1^{m_1}...x_n^{m_n}$ where $m_r \in \{0, ..., d\}$ for all $r \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Set $\Omega = \{x_1^{m_1}...x_n^{m_n} \mid m_r \in \{0, ..., d\}\}$ and let Υ be the set of all 1×3

matrix of the form $\begin{bmatrix} f_1 & f_2 & f_3 \end{bmatrix}$ with $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} \subseteq \Omega$. Using the row and column operations, the matrix A is equivalent to a $r_e \times tr_e$ matrix of the form

$$A \sim \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & A_{r_e} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.19}$$

where $A_i \in \Upsilon$ for all $i \in \{1, ..., r_e\}$. As a result, it follows by the Proposition 4.19 that $F^e_*(R) = \operatorname{Cok}_S A = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{r_e} \operatorname{Cok}_S A_i$ where $A_i \in \Upsilon$. Since Ω is finite set, the set Υ is also a finite set. Furthermore, $IF^e_*(R) = 0$ implies that $I \operatorname{Cok}_S A_i = 0$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., r_e\}$ and hence $\operatorname{Cok}_S A_i$ is R-module for each $i \in \{1, ..., r_e\}$. This proves that $F^e_*(R)$ has finite F-representation type by the the family of the R-modules $\{\operatorname{Cok}_S A_i | A_i \in \Upsilon\}$

□

Chapter 5

F-signature of specific hypersurfaces

The notion of F-signature is first defined explicitly in [12] by C. Huneke and G. Leuschke for F-finite rings. However, this notion first appeared implicitly in the work of K. Smith and M. Van den Bergh . The F-signature is defined as follows:

Definition 5.1 *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, K)$ be a d-dimensional F-finite Noetherian local ring of prime characteristic p with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ and residue field K. If $[k : k^p]$ is the dimension of k as k^p-vector space and $\alpha(R) = \log_p[k : k^p]$, then the F-signature of R that is denoted by $S(R)$ is defined by*

$$S(R) = \lim_{e\to\infty} \frac{\sharp(F^e_*(R), R)}{p^{e(d+\alpha(R))}}$$

where $\sharp(F^e_*(R), R)$ is the maximal rank of free direct summand of the R-module $F^e_*(R)$ (see corollary 2.11 and definition 2.12)

Keven Tucker in his paper [22] proved that this limit exists. In the following sections we will study the F-signature of specific hypersurfaces.

5.1 The F-signature of $\frac{S[[u,v]]}{f+uv}$ when f is a monomial

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.

Notation 5.2 *Let $\Delta = \{1, ..., n\}$ and let $d_1, ..., d_n$ be positive integers For every $s \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$, let $\Delta(j_1, ..., j_s) = \Delta - \{j_1, ..., j_s\}$.*

Define

$$W_s = \sum_{j_1,...,j_s \in \Delta} [(d - d_{j_1})...(d - d_{j_s})(\prod_{j \in \Delta(j_1,...,j_s)} d_j)]$$

For example, if d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 are positive integers and $d = \max\{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= (d-d_1)d_2d_3d_4 + (d-d_2)d_1d_3d_4 + (d-d_3)d_1d_2d_4 \\ &+ (d-d_4)d_1d_2d_4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_2 &= (d-d_1)(d-d_2)d_3d_4 + (d-d_1)(d-d_3)d_2d_4 + (d-d_1)(d-d_4)d_2d_3 \\ &+ (d-d_2)(d-d_3)d_1d_4 + (d-d_2)(d-d_4)d_1d_3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_3 &= (d-d_2)(d-d_3)(d-d_4)d_1 + (d-d_1)(d-d_3)(d-d_4)d_2 \\ &+ (d-d_1)(d-d_2)(d-d_4)d_3 + (d-d_1)(d-d_2)(d-d_3)d_4 \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.3 *Let K be a field of prime characteristic p with $[K : K^p] < \infty$, $e \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q = p^e$, and $S = K[[X_1, ..., X_n]]$. Let f be the monomial $f = X_1^{d_1}...X_n^{d_n}$ where d_j is a positive integer for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. If $d = \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\}$ and $R^\star = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$, then the F-signature of $R^\star$ is given by*

$$S(R^\star) = \frac{2}{d^{n+1}}[\frac{d_1d_2...d_n}{n+1} + \frac{W_1}{n} + ... + \frac{W_s}{n-s+1} + ... + \frac{W_{n-1}}{2}] \qquad (5.1)$$

where $W_1, ..., W_{n-1}$ are defined as in the notation 5.2.

Proof. Let $R = S/fS$ and $R^\star = S[[u, v]]/(f + uv)$. Set $[K : K^p] = b$ and recall from the notation [4.7] that Λ_e is the basis of K as K^q-vector space. We know by

Corollary 4.22 that

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\bigstar), R^\bigstar) = r_e + 2\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \tag{5.2}$$

where $r_e = b^e q^n$, $A = M_S(f, e)$ and $A^k = M_S(f^k, e)$. Since f^k is a monomial, it follows by Lemma 4.29 that the matrix $A^k = M_S(f^k, e)$ is equivalent to a diagonal matrix D whose diagonal entries are taken from the set $\{x_1^{u_1}...x_n^{u_n} | u_j \in \{0, ..., d_j\}$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$. This makes $\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(D)$ and consequently the number $\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k), R)$ is exactly the same as the number of the n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ associated with all $\lambda \in \Lambda_e$ satisfying that

$$F^e_*(\lambda x_1^{kd_1+\alpha_1}...x_n^{kd_n+\alpha_n}) = x_1^{d_1}...x_n^{d_n} F^e_*(\lambda x_1^{s_1}...x_n^{s_n}) \text{ for some } s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\} \tag{5.3}$$

However, an n-tuple $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ will satisfy the equation 5.3 if and only if $\alpha_j = d_j(q-k) + s_j$ for some $s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. As a result, the n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ will satisfy the equation 5.3 if and only if

$$d_j(q-k) \leq \alpha_j < q \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\}$$

Set $N_j(k) := \{\alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z} \,|\, d_j(q-k) \leq \alpha_j < q\}$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Therefore,

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e |N_1(k)||N_2(k)|...|N_n(k)| \tag{5.4}$$

Since $|N_j(k)| = q - d_j q + d_j k$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, it follows that

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e \prod_{j=1}^{n} (q - d_j q + d_j k) \tag{5.5}$$

Let $d = \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\}$, then $\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \neq 0$ if and only if $N_j(k) \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and consequently it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \neq 0 &\Leftrightarrow N_j(k) \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\} \\
&\Leftrightarrow d_j(q-k) < q \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\} \\
&\Leftrightarrow d(q-k) < q \\
&\Leftrightarrow \frac{q(d-1)}{d} < k
\end{aligned}$$

Let $q = du + t$ where $t \in \{0, .., d-1\}$. If $t \neq 0$, then one can easily verify that

$$\frac{q(d-1)}{d} < q - \frac{q-t}{d} < \frac{q(d-1)}{d} + 1 \tag{5.6}$$

Therefore, by 5.6 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \neq 0 &\Leftrightarrow \frac{q(d-1)}{d} < k \\ &\Leftrightarrow k \in \{q - \frac{q-t}{d}, ..., q-1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow k \in \{q - \frac{q-t}{d} + r \,|\, r \in \{0, ..., \frac{q-t}{d} - 1\}\} \end{aligned}$$

If $t = 0$, we get that $\frac{q(d-1)}{d} = q - \frac{q}{d} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and consequently

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow k \in \{q - \frac{q}{d} + r \,|\, r \in \{1, ..., \frac{q}{d} - 1\}\}$$

First assume that $t \neq 0$ and consequently $k \in \{q - \frac{q-t}{d} + r \,|\, r \in \{0, ..., \frac{q-t}{d} - 1\}\}$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) &= b^e \sum_{k=q-\frac{q-t}{d}}^{q-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (q - d_j q + d_j k) \\ &= b^e \sum_{r=0}^{\frac{q-t}{d}-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (q - d_j q + d_j (r + q - \frac{q-t}{d})) \\ &= b^e \sum_{r=0}^{\frac{q-t}{d}-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (d_j r + \frac{q(d-d_j)}{d} + \frac{d_j t}{d}) \end{aligned}$$

Our task now is to expand $\prod_{j=1}^{n} (d_j r + \frac{q(d-d_j)}{d} + \frac{d_j t}{d})$ in terms of r so that we can apply Faulhaber's formula below and take the limit in order to compute the F-signature.

Let $\Delta = \{1, ..., n\}$. For every $s \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$, let $\Delta(j_1, ..., j_s) = \Delta - \{j_1, ..., j_s\}$.

Define

$$W_s = \sum_{j_1, ..., j_s \in \Delta} [(d - d_{j_1}) ... (d - d_{j_s}) (\prod_{j \in \Delta(j_1, ..., j_s)} d_j)]$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=1}^{n}(d_j r + \frac{q(d-d_j)}{d} + \frac{d_j t}{d}) &= d_1 d_2 ... d_n r^n + \frac{q}{d} W_1 r^{n-1} + \frac{q^2}{d^2} W_2 r^{n-2} + \dots \\ &+ \frac{q^{n-1}}{d^{n-1}} W_{n-1} r + G(r) \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where $G(r)$ is a polynomial of degree $r-1$ of the form $G(r) = \sum_{c=0}^{n-1} g_c(q) r^c$ with $g_c(q)$ is a polynomial in q of degree $n-1-c$ for all $c \in \{0, ..., n-1\}$.

Set $\delta = \frac{q-t}{d} - 1$. By Faulhaber's formula, we get the following polynomial in δ of degree $n+1$

$$T_n(\delta) := \sum_{r=1}^{\delta} r^n = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j \binom{n+1}{j} B_j \delta^{n+1-j} \tag{5.8}$$

where B_j are are Bernoulli numbers, $B_0 = 1$ and $B_1 = \frac{-1}{2}$. This makes

$$T_n(\delta) = \frac{\delta^{n+1}}{n+1} + V_n(\delta) \tag{5.9}$$

where $V_n(\delta)$ is a polynomial of degree n in δ.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{e \to \infty} T_n(\frac{p^e - t}{d} - 1)/p^{e(n+1)} = \frac{1}{(n+1)d^{n+1}} \tag{5.10}$$

From Faulhaber's formula and the equations 5.7, and 5.9, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) &= b^e \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} [d_1 d_2 ... d_n r^n + \frac{q}{d} W_1 r^{n-1} + \frac{q^2}{d^2} W_2 r^{n-2} + \\
\dots &+ \frac{q^{n-1}}{d^{n-1}} W_{n-1} r + \frac{q^n}{d^n} W_n + G(r)] \\
&= b^e [d_1 d_2 ... d_n \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} r^n + \frac{q}{d} W_1 \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} r^{n-1} + \frac{q^2}{d^2} W_2 \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} r^{n-2} + \\
\dots &+ \frac{q^{n-1}}{d^{n-1}} W_{n-1} \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} r + \sum_{r=0}^{\delta} G(r)] \\
&= b^e [d_1 d_2 ... d_n (\frac{\delta^{n+1}}{n+1} + V_n(\delta)) + \frac{q}{d} W_1 (\frac{\delta^n}{n} + V_{n-1}(\delta)) + ... \\
... &+ \frac{q^s}{d^s} W_s (\frac{\delta^{n-s+1}}{n-s+1} + V_s(\delta)) + \\
... &+ \frac{q^{n-1}}{d^{n-1}} W_{n-1} (\frac{\delta^2}{2} + V_1(\delta)) \\
&+ \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} g_t(q) (\frac{\delta^{t+1}}{t+1} + V_t(\delta)) + (\delta+1) g_t(q)]
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $V_j(\delta)$ is a polynomial in q of degree less than $n+1$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} g_t(q)(\frac{\delta^{t+1}}{t+1} + V_t(\delta))$ is also a polynomial in q of degree less than $n+1$.

Therefore

$$\lim_{e\to\infty} \frac{1}{b^e p^{e(n+1)}} \sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = \frac{1}{d^{n+1}} [\frac{d_1 d_2 ... d_n}{n+1} + \frac{W_1}{n} + ... + \frac{W_s}{n-s+1} + ... + \frac{W_{n-1}}{2}]$$

By equation 5.2 and the above equation we conclude that the F-signature of the ring $R^\bigstar$ is given by

$$S(R^\bigstar) = \frac{2}{d^{n+1}} [\frac{d_1 d_2 ... d_n}{n+1} + \frac{W_1}{n} + ... + \frac{W_s}{n-s+1} + ... + \frac{W_{n-1}}{2}] \tag{5.11}$$

Second if $q = du$, then $\frac{q(d-1)}{d} = q - \frac{q}{d} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and consequently

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow k \in \{q - \frac{q}{d} + r \,|\, r \in \{1, ..., \frac{q}{d} - 1\}\}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) &= b^e \sum_{k=q-\frac{q}{d}+1}^{q-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(q - d_j q + d_j k) \\ &= b^e \sum_{r=1}^{\frac{q}{d}-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(q - d_j q + d_j(r + q - \frac{q}{d})) \\ &= b^e \sum_{r=1}^{\frac{q}{d}-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(d_j r + \frac{q(d-d_j)}{d})\end{aligned}$$

By an argument similar to the above argument, we conclude the same result that

$$S(R^{\bigstar}) = \frac{2}{d^{n+1}}[\frac{d_1 d_2 ... d_n}{n+1} + \frac{W_1}{n} + ... + \frac{W_s}{n-s+1} + ... + \frac{W_{n-1}}{2}] \tag{5.12}$$

□

5.2 The F-signature of S/fS and $S[[y]]/fS[[y]]$ are the same

Proposition 5.4 *Let K be a field of prime characteristic $p \geq 2$ with $[K : K^p] < \infty$, and $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$. If f is a nonunit nonzero element of S and y is a new variable on S, then the F-signature of S/fS and $S[[y]]/fS[[y]]$ are the same and consequently the F-signature of S/fS and $S[[y_1, ..., y_m]]/fS[[y_1, ..., y_m]]$ are the same for every positive integer m.*

Proof. Let $R = S/fS$ and $B = S[[y]]/fS[[y]]$. For any e and $q = p^e$, recall that if $A = M_S(f, e)$, then $F_*^e(S/fS) = Cok_S(A)$ and $M_{S[[y]]}(f, e)$ is a $q \times q$ matrix over the ring $M_{r_e}(S[[y]])$ that is given by

$$M_{S[[y]]}(f, e) = \begin{pmatrix} A & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & A \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.13}$$

Recall that (A, A^{q-1}) is a matrix factorization of f that can be represented uniquely up to equivalence as

$$(A, A^{q-1}) \sim (\phi, \psi) \oplus (f, 1)^u \oplus (1, f)^v$$

where (ϕ, ψ) is a reduced matrix factorization of f over S (and hence over $S[[y]]$) ,$u = \sharp(Cok_S(A), R)$ and $v = \sharp(Cok_S(A^{q-1}), R)$ (see orollary 3.10). In another words, A is equivalent to the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \phi & \\ & fI_u \end{pmatrix}$ where I_u is the $u \times u$ identity matrix. Since (ϕ, ψ) is also a reduced matrix factorization of f in $S[[y]]$, it follows by Proposition 3.9 that $Cok_{S[[y]]}(\phi)$ is stable B-module and $Cok_{S[[y]]} \begin{bmatrix} \phi & \\ & fI_u \end{bmatrix} = B^u \oplus Cok_{S[[y]]}(\phi)$. Using this result and equation 5.13 we conclude that $F^e_*(B) = B^{qu} \oplus [Cok_{S[[y]]}(\phi)]^{\oplus q}$ where $[Cok_{S[[y]]}(\phi)]^{\oplus q}$ is stable B-module. This shows that

$$\sharp(F^e_*(B), B) = q\sharp(F^e_*(R), R) \tag{5.14}$$

Therefore

$$S(B) = \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{\sharp(F^e_*(B), B)}{q^n} = \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{q\sharp(F^e_*(R), R)}{q^n} = \lim_{q\to\infty} \frac{\sharp(F^e_*(R), R)}{q^{n-1}} = S(R)$$

□

5.3 The F-signature of $\frac{S[[z]]}{(f+z^2)}$ when f is a monomial

We keep the same notation as in section 4.2 unless otherwise stated.

Lemma 5.5 *Let K be a field of prime characteristic $p > 2$ with $[K : K^p] < \infty$ and let $T = S[z]$ if $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ (or $T = S[[z]]$ if $S = K[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$). If $A = M_S(f, e)$ for some $f \in S$, then*

$$F^e_*(T/(f + z^2)) = \mathrm{Cok}_T \begin{bmatrix} A^{\frac{q-1}{2}} & -zI \\ zI & A^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Proof. Let I be the identity matrix in $M_{r_e}(S)$. It follows by Proposition 4.14 that $M_T(f+z^2,e)$ is a $q \times q$ matrix over the ring $M_{r_e}(S)$ that is given by

$$M_T(f+z^2,e) = \begin{bmatrix} A & & & & & zI & 0 \\ 0 & A & & & & & zI \\ I & 0 & A & & & & \\ & I & 0 & A & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & I & 0 & A & \\ & & & & I & 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$$

From Corollary 2.22 we conclude that the matrix $M_T(f+z^2,e)$ is equivalent to the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & zI & & (-1)^{\frac{q-1}{2}}A^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & & & & (-1)^{\frac{q+1}{2}}A^{\frac{q-1}{2}} & & zI \\ I & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\ & I & 0 & 0 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & I & 0 & 0 & & \\ & & & & I & 0 & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Therefore,

$$F^e_*(T/(f+z^2)) = \mathrm{Cok}_T \begin{bmatrix} A^{\frac{q-1}{2}} & -zI \\ zI & A^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}$$

□

Proposition 5.6 *Let $f = x_1^{d_1}...x_n^{d_n}$ be a monomial in $S = K[[x_1,...,x_n]]$ where d_j is a positive integer for each $j \in \{1,...,n\}$ and K is a field of prime characteristic*

$p > 2$ with $[K : K^p] < \infty$. Let $R = S/fS$ and $R^\sharp = S[[z]]/(f + z^2)$. it follows that:
1)If $d_j = 1$ for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, then $S(S[[z]]/(f + z^2)) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$.
2) If $d = \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} \geq 2$, then $S(S[[z]]/(f + z^2)) = 0$.

Proof. Set $[K : K^p] = b$ and recall from the notation [4.7] that Λ_e is the basis of K as K^q-vector space. If $A = M_S(f, e)$, we know by the above lemma that

$$F^e_*(R^\sharp) = \mathrm{Cok}_{S[[z]]} \begin{bmatrix} A^{\frac{q-1}{2}} & -zI \\ zI & A^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } A = M_S(f, e)$$

It follows by Corollary 3.10 that

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp) = \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q-1}{2}}), R) + \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q+1}{2}}), R) \tag{5.15}$$

Let $k \in \{\frac{q-1}{2}, \frac{q+1}{2}\}$. It follows by Proposition 4.10 that $A^k = M_S(f^k, e)$. Since f^k is a monomial, it follows by Lemma 4.29 that the matrix $A^k = M_S(f^k, e)$ is equivalent to a diagonal matrix D whose diagonal entries are taken from the set $\{x_1^{u_1}...x_n^{u_n} | u_j \in \{0, ..., d_j\}$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}\}$. This makes $\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k) = \mathrm{Cok}_S(D)$ and consequently the number $\sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^k), R)$ is exactly the same as the number of the n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$asscociated with all $\lambda \in \Lambda_e$ satisfying that

$$F^e_*(\lambda x_1^{kd_1+\alpha_1}...x_n^{kd_n+\alpha_n}) = x_1^{d_1}...x_n^{d_n} F^e_*(\lambda x_1^{s_1}...x_n^{s_n}) \text{ for some } s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\} \tag{5.16}$$

However, an n-tuple $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ will satisfy the equation 5.16 if and only if $\alpha_j = d_j(q - k) + s_j$ for some $s_j \in \{0, ..., q-1\}$ for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. As a result, an n-tuples $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ will satisfy the equation 5.16 if and only if

$$d_j(q - k) \leq \alpha_j < q \text{ for all } j \in \{1, ..., n\}$$

Set $N_j(k) := \{\alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z} \,|\, d_j(q - k) \leq \alpha_j < q\}$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Therefore,

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e |N_1(k)||N_2(k)|...|N_n(k)| \tag{5.17}$$

Since $|N_j(k)| = q - d_j q + d_j k$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, it follows that

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e \prod_{j=1}^{n} (q - d_j q + d_j k) \tag{5.18}$$

Now if $d_1 = d_2 = ... = d_n = 1$, it follows by equation 5.18 that $\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e k^n$ for $k \in \{\frac{q-1}{2}, \frac{q+1}{2}\}$. Therefore, by the equation 5.15 we conclude that

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp) = b^e[(\frac{q-1}{2})^n + (\frac{q+1}{2})^n] \tag{5.19}$$

and consequently

$$S(R^\sharp) = \lim_{e\to\infty} \sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp)/b^e p^{en} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$$

Now let $d_i = \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\}$ for some $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$. First assume that $d_i = 2$. If $k = \frac{q-1}{2}$, it follows that $d_i(q-k) > q$ and consequently $|N_i(k)| = 0$. This makes by 5.17 that $\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = 0$. When $k = \frac{q+1}{2}$, we get that $d_i(q-k) = q-1$ and consequently $N_i(k) = \{q-1\}$ which makes $|N_i(k)| = 1$. Notice that when $k = \frac{q+1}{2}$ and $d_j = 1$, it follows that $|N_j(k)| = \frac{q+1}{2}$. As a result, if $k = \frac{q+1}{2}$, we conclude that

$$\sharp(Cok_S(A^k), R) = b^e|N_1(k)||N_2(k)|...|N_n(k)| \leq b^e(\frac{q+1}{2})^{n-1}$$

Therefore,

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp) = \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q-1}{2}}), R) + \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q+1}{2}}), R) \leq b^e(\frac{q+1}{2})^{n-1}$$

As a result,

$$S(R^\sharp) = \lim_{e\to\infty} \sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp)/b^e p^{en} = 0$$

Second assume that $d_i > 2$. In this case, for every $k \in \{\frac{q-1}{2}, \frac{q+1}{2}\}$, it follows that $d_i(q-k) > q$ and consequently $|N_i(k)| = 0$. Therefore

$$\sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp) = \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q-1}{2}}), R) + \sharp(\mathrm{Cok}_S(A^{\frac{q+1}{2}}), R) = 0$$

and consequently

$$S(R^\sharp) = \lim_{e\to\infty} \sharp(F^e_*(R^\sharp), R^\sharp)/b^e p^{en} = 0$$

Notice that when $d = \max\{d_1, ..., d_n\} > 2$, we can prove that $S(R^\sharp) = 0$ using Fedder's Criteria 2.14. Indeed, let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of $S[[z]]$ and let $R^\sharp =$

$S[[z]]/(f+z^2)$. If $d=\max\{d_1,...,d_n\}>2$, then $(f+z^2)^{q-1}\in\mathfrak{m}^{[q]}$ which makes, by Fedder's Criteria, $\sharp(F_*^e(R^\sharp),R^\sharp)=0$ for all $e\in\mathbb{Z}^+$. This means clearly that

$$S(R^\sharp)=\lim_{e\to\infty}\sharp(F_*^e(R^\sharp),R^\sharp)/b^ep^{en}=0$$

□

5.4 The F-signature of the ring $S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$

Proposition 5.7 *Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of the ring $S=K[[X_1,...,X_n]]$ and let f be an element in $\mathfrak{m}-\{0\}$. If $d\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\Re=S[[Y]]/(Y^{p^d}+f)$, then $S(\Re)=\frac{\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)}{p^{nd}}$.*

$$S(\Re)=\begin{cases}\frac{\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)}{p^{nd}} \text{ if } [K:K^p]=1\\ 0 \text{ if } [K:K^p]>1\end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $[K:K^p]=b$ and let $e\in\mathbb{Z}$ such that $e>d$. If $A=M_S(f,e)$, we proved in the proof of Proposition 4.20 that

$$F_*^e(\Re)=\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[Y]]}(M_{S[[Y]]}(Y^{p^d}+f,e))=(\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[Y]]}(YI+A^{p^{e-d}}))^{\oplus p^d} \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$[\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[Y]]}(YI+A^{p^{e-d}})]^{\oplus p^e}=[F_*^d(\Re)]^{\oplus p^{(n+1)(e-d)}} \tag{5.21}$$

If $W=\mathrm{Cok}_{S[[Y]]}(YI+A^{p^{e-d}})$, by the equations 5.20, 5.21 we get that

$$\sharp(F_*^e(\Re),\Re)=p^d\sharp(W,\Re) \text{ and } p^e\sharp(W,\Re)=p^{(n+1)(e-d)}\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)$$

This makes

$$\sharp(F_*^e(\Re),\Re)=p^{n(e-d)}\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)$$

and consequently

$$S(\Re)=\lim_{e\to\infty}\frac{\sharp(F_*^e(\Re),\Re)}{b^ep^{en}}=\lim_{e\to\infty}\frac{p^{n(e-d)}\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)}{b^ep^{en}}$$

This shows that

$$S(\Re)=\begin{cases}\frac{\sharp(F_*^d(\Re),\Re)}{p^{nd}} \text{ if } b=1\\ 0 \text{ if } b>1\end{cases}$$

□

Bibliography

[1] I. M. Aberbach and G. J. Leuschke, *The F-signature and strong F-regularity*,Math. Res. Lett. 10 (2003), 5156. 6

[2] M. F. Atyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addition-Wesley Publshing Company, 1969. 40, 46

[3] N.R. Baeth and R. Wiegand, *Factorization theory and decomposition of modules*, Am. Math. Mon. 120 (2013), 3 34. 5, 12, 13, 42

[4] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay Rings*, vol. 39, Cambridge 33, 40, 58

[5] D. S.Dummit and R.M.Foote, *Abstract Algebra*, John Wiely and Sons, Inc, 2004. 37

[6] G. J. Leuschke and R. Wiegand, *Cohen-Macaulay Representations*, Providence, R.I. : American Mathematical Society, c2012. 12, 40, 41, 72, 78, 79

[7] D. Eisenbud, *Homological algebra on a complete intersection, with an application to group representations*, Transactions of the AMS 260 (1980), 3564. 36

[8] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra With a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, GTM, Vol. 150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. 11, 49

[9] D. Eisenbud and I. Peeva. *Matrix factorizations for complete intersections and minimal free resolutions*. arXiv:1306.2615 36

[10] R. Fedder, *F-purity and rational singularity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 278 (1983), no. 2, 461480. MR701505 (84h:13031) 13

[11] M. Hchster and J. L. Roberts, *The purity of the Frobenius and local cohomology*, Adv. in Math. 21 (1976), 117-172 13

[12] C. Huneke and G. Leuschke, *Two theorems about maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules*, Math. Ann. 324 (2002), no. 2, 391404. MR 1 933 863 6, 82

[13] Y. Kamoi, *A study of Noetherian G-graded rings*, thesis.

[14] S. Lawrence Levy and J. Chris Robson, *Matrices and pairs of modules*, J. Algebra 29 (1974), 427454. MR0340337 (49:5092) 14

[15] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Ring Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Adv. Math. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986. 12, 15

[16] W. F. Moore ,M. Rogers, and S. Sather-Wagstaf , *Monomial Ideals and Their Decompositions*, https://www.ndsu.edu/pubweb/ ssatherw/DOCS/monomial.pdf 80

[17] G.Seibert, *The Hilbert-Kunz function of rings of finite Cohen-Macaulay type*, Arch. Math. 69 (1997), 286296. 5

[18] T.Shibuta, *One-dimensional rings of finite F-representation type*, Journal of Algebra, 15 April 2011, Vol.332(1), pp.434-441 5, 44, 45

[19] B. Singh, *Basic Commutative Algebra*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd. 32, 40

[20] K. E.Smith, and M.Van den Bergh, , *Simplicity of rings of differential operators in prime characteristic*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 75 (1997), no. 1, 3262. 4, 45

[21] S.Takagi, and R.Takahashi, *D-modules over rings with finite F-representation type Math.* Res. Lett. 15 (2008), no3. 563581. 5, 8, 45

[22] K. Tucker, *F-signature exists*, Invent. Math. 190 (2012), no. 3, 743765. 5, 6, 82

[23] Y.Yao, *Modules with finite F-representation type*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 72 (2005), no. 1, 5372 5

[24] Y.Yao, *Observations on the F-signature of local rings of characteristic p*, J. Algebra 299 (2006), no. 1, 198218. MR2225772 (2007k:13007) 6

[25] Y. Yoshino, *Cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 146, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. MR 1079937 39, 41